



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

मंगलवार, 08 अप्रैल, 2025 / 18 चैत्र, 1947

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR EMPLOYMENT & OVERSEAS PLACEMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171002, the 14th January, 2025

No: LEP-E/1/2024.—In exercise of the powers vested under section 17 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of

07—राजपत्र / 2025—08—04—2025

(375)

awards of the following cases announced by the **Presiding Judge, Industrial Tribunal-cum Labour Court, Shimla**, on the website of the Printing & Stationery Department, Himachal Pradesh i.e. “e-Gazette”.

| Sl. No. | Case No. | Petitioner | Respondent | Date of Award/ Orders |
|---------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Ref.72/2024 | Shankar Pathak | M/s F.M. Huhtamaki India Ltd. | 11.11.2024 |
| 2. | Ref.47/2018 | Dev Raj | Director Horticulture ,Shimla | 11.11.2024 |
| 3. | Ref.79/2023 | Kaka Ram | M/s Krishna Udyog, P/Sahib | 16.11.2024 |
| 4. | App 58/2022 | Sh. Pawan Thakur | M/s Regal Kitchen Food Ltd. | 18.11.2024 |
| 5. | Ref.141/2004 | Sh. Chatter Singh | The XEN, HPSEB, Rajgarh. | 27.11.2024 |
| 6. | Ref.196/2018 | Sh. Duni Chand | S.C. Johnson Products (P) Ltd. | 28.11.2024 |

By order,

PRIYANKA BASU INGTY, IAS
Secretary (Lab. Emp. & O.P.)

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA.

Reference Number : 72 of 2024

Instituted on : 03.09.2024

Decided on : 11.11.2024.

Shankar Pathak, S/o Sh. Janardan Pathak, Village & P.O. Farda, Tehsil Jamalpur, District Munger, Bihar
...Petitioner

Versus

The Factory Manager M/S Huhtamaki India Ltd., Plot No. 09, Village Kunjhal, P.O. Barotiwala, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P.
...Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner : Nemo.

For the Respondent : Sh. Rajat Sharma, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:

“Whether termination of the services of Shri Shankar Pathak, S/o Sh. Janardan Pathak, Village & P.O. Farda, Tehsil Jamalpur, District Munger, Bihar by the factory Manager, M/S Huhtamaki India Ltd., Plot No. 09, Village Kunjhal, P.O. Barotiwala, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. w.e.f. 28.03.2023 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement, seniority, amount of back wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management?”

2. The case was listed for appearance of the parties for today but, neither the petitioner nor any counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the petitioner had remained *ex-parte*.

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Act’ for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

“(b) “award” means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;”.

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called “The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957.” Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

“10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party.”

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

“Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented.”

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called “The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974.” Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

“Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented.”

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex parte* award. This Tribunal in these

circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor any counsel on his behalf has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that the termination of his services *w.e.f.* 28.03.2023 was without complying with the provisions of the Act and, thus, illegal and unjustified. However, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman had not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 11th day of November, 2024.

Sd/-

(ANUJA SOOD)

*Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial
Tribunal, Shimla, H.P.*

**IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA.**

Reference No : 47 of 2018

Instituted on : 20.02.2018

Decided on : 11.11.2024

Dev Raj S/o Late Sh. Lagan Dass, R/o Village Bamnhol, P.O. Dharogra, Tehsil Sunni,
District Shimla, H.P. *...Petitioner.*

Versus

The Deputy Director, Horticulture, Shimla-2, (H.P.)

...Respondent .

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Sh. Pradeep Verma, Adv

For the respondent : Sh. Manoj Sharma, AD

AWARD

The following reference was received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:

“Whether termination of the services of Sh. Dev Raj, S/o Late Sh. Lagan Dass, R/o Village Bamnhol, P.O. Dharogra, Tehsil Sunni, District Shimla, H.P. by the by the Deputy Director, Horticulture, Shimla-2 (H.P.) w.e.f. 31.01.2016 allegedly without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement, amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above ex-worker is entitled to from the above employers?”

2. The case of the petitioner, as it emerges from the statement of claim is that the petitioner/ workman was engaged by the respondent after granting the necessary approval/ sanction for discharging the work of Chowkidar w.e.f. 01.04.2008. The petitioner was deployed by the respondent for the work of Chowkidar in the office of PCDO Horticulture, Sunni, District Shimla. As per norms the petitioner was working w.e.f. 01.04.2008 continuously therefore he was required to be regularized but in the month of May 2016 not only that services of the workman/ applicant were discontinued, but his wages amounting of Rs. 46,000/- for which he was legally entitled were also withheld wrongly and illegally by the respondent. After the services of the petitioner were discontinued, he represented to the respondent by issuing legal notice which was sent through registered post but even after receipt of such notice, no steps were taken by the respondent in this regard. Petitioner raised demand notice under Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter to be referred as the Act), but respondent took false stand that the applicant was engaged for temporary services and he was not entitled for regular/ contract services. The petitioner was to be confirmed as contractual or regular employee as he had completed regular eight years of service, but the respondent has deprived him from his legal right. The services of the petitioner have been terminated without any notice and payment of compensation which is against the mandatory provisions of the Act. It has been prayed through this claim that the termination of the petitioner from May, 2016 be declared illegal and be set-aside and petitioner be reinstated back in the services with the direction to pay Rs. 46,000/- along with interest and other benefits as well as full back wages, seniority and with all other incidental service benefits with cost.

3. Notice of this claim was sent to the respondent in pursuance thereof respondent filed reply in which it took preliminary objections of maintainability, cause of action, petitioner has failed to fulfill the criteria of the policy of regularization himself. Petitioner has also not completed the required work of 48 hours in a week or eight hours in a day. On merits, it is averred that petitioner was never engaged as Chowkidar in the year 2008. It was claimed that the work was allotted on quotation basis after inviting the tender from time to time. Work was allotted to the petitioner being lowest quotation and payment in lieu of work was made to the petitioner. It was averred that services of the petitioner were never terminated by the respondent. Petitioner was allotted work on quotation basis and he never worked on muster roll or pay roll with the respondent department. It was further averred that there is no violation of the provisions of the Act and prayed for dismissal of the present reference.

4. Petitioner filed rejoinder in which he denied the preliminary objections and reiterated the averments as made in the statement of claim.

5. On the pleadings, this Court formulated the following issues on 20.11.2018.

1. Whether the termination of services of the petitioner w.e.f. 31.01.2016 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is illegal and unjustified? .. *OPP.*
2. If issue No. 1 is proved in affirmative, to what relief of service benefits the petitioner is entitled? .. *OPP.*
3. Whether the petition is not maintainable, as alleged? .. *OPR.*

Relief.

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. I have heard the Ld. Counsel for the petitioner and Ld. ADA for respondent and also scrutinize the record of the case carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings on the same are as under:

Issue No. 1 : No.

Issue No. 2 : No. Not entitled to any relief.

Issue No. 3 : No.

Relief : Reference is answered in negative as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issues No.1 & 2

9. Both these issues are interlinked and inter-connected and can be disposed off by the same amount of discussion of evidence on record, as such both issues are taken up together. The onus to prove issues no.1 & 2 is on the petitioner.

10. Coming to evidence led by the petitioner, petitioner examined Sh. Onkar Walia, Senior Assistant for the office of Deputy Director, Horticulture, Shimla, H.P., as PW-1. He had brought summoned record. He deposed that the petitioner has worked with the department from 25.06.2008 to 30.01.2016. The detail of the work conducted by him Ex. PW-1/A. The petitioner was employed on quotation basis and work was not allotted as per days. The services of the petitioner were not terminated and petitioner has been paid as per the details as mentioned in Ex. PW-1/A.

11. During cross-examination, he admitted that petitioner was employed on quotation basis and he had not completed 240 days in any calendar year and he also admitted that department had never terminated the services of the petitioner and payments of the petitioner were never made on muster roll basis.

12. Other witness examined by the petitioner Sh. Gunna Nand as PW-2, who deposed that he used to work in the Horticulture farm at Sunni District Sheila since the year 1981-1982. He worked on daily wages basis and his services were regularized in the year 1994. He retired from the service in the year 2010. He further deposed that he knows Dev Raj (petitioner), who used to work in the nursery. He joined in the year 2008 and continued working as such till 2015-2016. He used to work as Chowkidar and also worked in the nursery as a Gardner and a pruner.

13. During cross-examination, he admitted that he was engaged on muster roll basis and since he had completed 240 days in each calendar year thus, his services were regularized in the year 1994. He showed ignorance that petitioner was engaged on quotation basis. He admitted that department used to deposit amount in the account of the petitioner for the work done by him. He showed ignorance that department had made all the permissible payment to the petitioner.

14. Petitioner stepped into the witness box as PW-3 and led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. PW-3/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the petition. He also placed on record legal notice dated 10.07.2016 Ex. PW-3/B along with postal receipt Ex. PW-3/C.

15. During cross-examination, he denied that he was engaged on quotation basis. He admitted that mark-R-1 has been written by him in respect of certain quotation. He also admitted that mark-R-2 to mark-R-8 pertains to grant a work on quotation basis. He denied that his services were not terminated by the department. He further denied that he has not completed 240 days in any calendar.

16. This is the entire evidence which has been led by the petitioner.

17. In rebuttal, respondent examined Sh. Desh Raj, as RW-1, who also led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. RW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the reply, he also placed on record copy of quotation for the year 2008-2009 Ex. RW-1/A, copy of statement of quotation work for the year 2008-2009 Ex. RW-1/B, comparative statement for month of January, 2015 Ex. RW-1/C and comparative statement Ex. RW-1/D, comparative statement Ex. RW-1/E to Ex. RW-1/H, Ex. RW-1/J to Ex. RW-1/Q, quotation Ex. RW1/R-1 to Ex. RW1/R-16 and copies of approvals Ex. RW1/S-1 to Ex. RW1/S-10 and copy of legal notice Ex. RW-1/T and its reply Ex. RW-1/U and reply to demand notice RW-1/V, payment receipts Ex. RW1/W-1 to Ex. RW1/W-8.

18. During cross-examination, he stated that he is working with respondent department since 10.11.1991. Petitioner worked in nursery at Sunni from 2008-2009 to 2015-2016 on quotation basis. He denied that petitioner had completed 240 days in a calendar year. He further deposed that no one was sanctioning leave(s) of the petitioner as he was working on quantum basis. He further deposed that once the work is over repudiation of the job is automatic.

19. This is the entire evidence led by the respondent.

20. So far as the case of the petitioner is concerned, it is the claim of the petitioner that he was engaged as Chowkidar & Gardner in the year 2008 and he continuously worked till May, 2016. The plea of the petitioner is that he was regularly discharging his duties since 01.04.2008 as Chowkidar in the office of PCDO Horticulture, Sunni, District Shimla till May 2016, when his services were illegally terminated by the respondent. The onus to prove this fact was heavily on the petitioner, however, there is no evidence on record to establish that the petitioner was working with the respondent regularly as a daily wagers on muster roll basis nor there is any evidence that he had completed 240 days in each calendar year.

21. Section 25-B of the Act defines “continuous service”. In terms of Sub Section (2) of Section 25-B, if a workman during a period of twelve calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer 240 days within a period of one year, he will be deemed to be in continuous service. The burden of proof is on the petitioner to show that he had worked for 240 days in the preceding twelve calendar months prior to his alleged retrenchment. The law on this issue is well settled. In *R.M Yellatty Vs. Assistant Executive Engineer, (2006) 1 SCC 106*, it has been held by the Hon’ble Supreme Court that the burden of proof is on the claimant to show that he had worked for 240 days in a given year which evidence is clearly missing in this case.

22. It has been laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in case titled as *Mohd. Ali vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors., (2019) 1 SCC (L&S) 138* that when the workman had not worked for the required 240 days of working in the period of twelve calendar months preceding the date of dismissal, he is not entitled to take the benefits of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act. Therefore, the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act are not attracted in this case.

23. So far the plea of Ld. Counsel for the petitioner that the period of employment/engagement of the petitioner has to be established by the employer is concerned, this argument has no force. In *Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195)*, it was held that the burden was on the workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment. In *M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246)* the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows:

“The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously. At this stage it may be useful to refer to a judgment of this Court in the case of *Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas JT 2004 (7) SC 248* wherein this Court disagreed with the High Court's view of drawing an adverse inference in regard to the nonproduction of certain relevant documents. This is what this Court had to say in that regard:

"A court of law even in a case where provisions of the Indian Evidence Act apply, may presume or may not presume that if a party despite possession of the best evidence had not produced the same, it would have gone against his contentions. The matter, however, would be different where despite direction by a court the evidence is withheld. Presumption as to adverse inference for non-production of evidence is always optional and one of the factors which is required to be taken into consideration is the background of facts involved in the lis. The presumption, thus, is not obligatory because notwithstanding the intentional non-production, other circumstances may exist upon which such intentional non-production may be found to be justifiable on some reasonable grounds. In the instant case, the Industrial Tribunal did not draw any adverse inference against the appellant. It was within its jurisdiction to do so particularly having regard to the nature of the evidence adduced by the respondent."

24. In *Manager, Reserve Bank of India, Bangalore v. S. Mani and Ors. (2005(5) SCC 100)* a three-Judge Bench of this Court again considered the matter and held that the initial burden of proof was on the workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service. Tribunal's view that the burden was on the employer was held to be erroneous. In *Batala Cooperative Sugar Mills Ltd. v. Sowaran Singh (2005 (7) Supreme 165)* it was held as follows:

“So far as the question of onus regarding working for more than 240 days is concerned, as observed by this Court in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25) the onus is on the workman.”

25. The respondent while examining RW-1, has placed on record, the record pertaining to the quotation since, 2008-09 till 2015-16. The petitioner has admitted his signature on mark R-1 (Ex. RW-1/R-4) *vide* which had applied for the work of nursery at Sunni for the year 2015. Apart from this, he has also admitted documents mark R-2 to Mark R-8 (Ex. RW-1/A to Ex. RW-1/G). The comparative statements produced on record clearly shows that the work of night duties and nursery was allotted to the petitioner from 2008- 2009 to 2015-16 as the quotation(s) of the petitioner were found to be lowest. Approval(s) have also been sought by the respondent through various letters, placed on record, to allot the work to the petitioner being the lowest quotation(s) from time to time. It is also evident from the documents produced by the respondent that the work was allotted to the petitioner on quotation basis. It is also evident from the record that due payments for the work which was allotted to the petitioner have also been paid by the respondent. Since, the employment of the petitioner was purely on quotation basis as his quotation(s) were lowest, he was allotted the work of nursery as well as of chowkidar. The petitioner has failed to prove that he has worked as daily wagers on muster basis with the respondent and further failed to establish on record that he had completed 240 in preceding twelve months from the date of his alleged termination in May, 2016. No such record has been produced by the petitioner which could show that he has completed 240 in preceding twelve months from the date of his alleged termination. As such point in hand the issue is answered in negative.

Issue No.3

26. So far as issue No. 3 is concerned, the respondent has not led any evidence to establish on record that as to how the present claim petition is not maintainable. I find nothing wrong with this petition which is perfectly maintainable in the present form. The issue in question is answered in negative.

Relief.

27. For all the foregoing reasons discussed hereinabove *supra*, the claim filed by the petitioner fails and is hereby dismissed. Let a copy of this award be communicated to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File, after due completion, be consigned to records.

Announced in the open Court today on this 11th day of November, 2024.

Sd/-

(ANUJA SOOD)
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial
Tribunal, Shimla, H.P.

**BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA.**

Reference Number : 79 of 2023

Instituted on : 10.05.2023

Decided on : 16.11.2024

Kaka Ram, S/o Sh. Sadanand, R/o Village and Post Office Matar, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmour, H.P. . .Petitioner.

Versus

The Occupier, M/s Krishna Udyog, Village Rampur Banjaran, P.O. Dhaulakaun, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmour, H.P. . .Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondent : Ms. Diksha Dhanta, Adv

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:

“Whether the termination of services of Sh. Kaka Ram S/o Sh. Sadanand R/o Village and Post Office Matar, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmour, H.P. by the Occupier, M/s Krishna Udyog, R/o Village Rampur Banjaran, P.O. Dhaulakaun, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmour, H.P. w.e.f. 10.06.2022 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged by the workman, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management?”

2. The case was listed for filing of statement of claim but, however the learned counsel for the petitioner has withdrawn his Power of Attorney and made statement that he has informed the date of hearing to the petitioner through registered post but the petitioner has not appeared in the Court, despite due intimation about the date of hearing fixed for today the case is listed for filing statement of claim. Despite due notice of the date of hearing, the petitioner had remained *ex-parte*.

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Act’ for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

“(b) “award” means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;”.

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called “The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957.” Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

“10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party.”

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

“Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented.”

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called “The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974.” Rule 25 thereof reads thus:

“Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented.”

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, in fact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor any counsel on his behalf has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that the termination of his services *w.e.f.* 10.06.2022 was without complying with the provisions of the Act and, thus, illegal and unjustified. However, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman had not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Sd/-

(ANUJA SOOD)

*Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial
Tribunal, Shimla, H.P.*

**IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Application No : 58 of 2022
Instituted on : 07.05.2022
Decided on : 18.11.2024

Pawan Thakur, S/o Sh. Pyar Chand Thakur, R/o Village Baniru, P.O. Bagg, Tehsil
Ladbharol, District Mandi, H.P. Petitioner.

Versus

M/s Regal Kitchen Food Limited, Plot No. 7, Barotiwala Industrial Area, P.O. Barotiwala,
Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P., through its authorized representatives Sh. Virender Kumar.
... Respondent

Claim petition under Section 2-A & 33 (C) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Ms. Ranjana Bali, Legal AID Counsel
For the respondent : *ex-parte*

AWARD.

The present claim petition has been filed by the applicant under Section 2-A & 33 (C) of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (hereinafter to be referred as the Act), for seeking relief of reinstatement in service along with consequential relief of back wages continuity of service and allied service benefits.

2. The facts as emerges from the statement of claim are that the petitioner was employed by the respondent on 27.10.2021 as a Senior Executive Accounts Manager in the company. His monthly wages were Rs. 25,000/-. The petitioner was working to the entire satisfaction of the respondent with sincerity, cautiously and honestly. The services of the petitioner were orally terminated on 12.03.2022, without following the proper procedure as per the provisions of the Act. Neither any notice indicating the reasons for the termination, nor any enquiry was conducted by the respondent with regard to the illegal termination of the petitioner/ claimant. The petitioner had received a warning letter from the respondent through e-mail on 24.03.2022, whereas the

respondent has terminated the services of the petitioner on 12.03.2022. Petitioner had send whatsapp messages to the Managing Director Shri Manish Madan that some of the people were creating complication in proper working in the company. However, respondent did not respond the whatsapp messages of the petitioner. Petitioner again sent a whatsapp message to the M.D. Shri Manish Madan, informing that the General Manager Sh. Hameesh Ji and H.R. Sh. Virender Ji refused the petitioner to come for duty on 13.03.2022 due to imposition of some fake allegations of misbehave and sexual harassment without any evidence. The petitioner has done all the operation of accounts work individually with sincerity and dedication. Some people created obstacle in the work of the petitioner as they were very corrupted and they were getting lots of money by wrong ways for many years, however, the respondent did not respond to the whatsapp messages of the petitioner. Petitioner also sent demand notice on 21.03.2022 through e-mail, however respondent did not respond to the demand notice, as such petitioner again sent notice dated 17.04.2022 to the respondent through e-mail but this notice was also not replied by the respondent. On 15.03.2022 petitioner sent a whatsapp messages to the M.D. informing that his wife is a Kidney patient who was taking treatment from PGI Chandigarh and she required kidney transplant next month. He also informed that he was without work. However respondent threatened the petitioner with dire consequences and levelled false charges upon him. Petitioner lodged complaint at Police Station Baddi, District Solan, H.P., for self-protection against the respondent. Petitioner claimed that his termination is without any reasonable cause and against the mandatory provisions of the Act. It has been prayed that he be reinstated in services with all consequential benefits with full back wages.

3. Notice of this application was sent to the respondent in pursuance thereof respondent contested the claim by filing reply, in which it took preliminary objection of maintainability. It was averred that the claimant does not fall under the Industrial Disputes Act, as he was employed as Senior Executive Accounts and Finance Manager in the Company. On merits, it was averred that the petitioner was employed as Senior Executive Accounts & Finance in the company and was getting salary Rs. 25,000/- per month. It was denied that the services of the petitioner were terminated orally on 12.03.2022 without following the proper procedure. It was claimed that the services of the petitioner were terminated as he had failed to show any improvement in his behavior despite repeated warnings. The petitioner was on probation for six months when, it was found that the services of the petitioner were not to the entire satisfaction of the respondent. After observing all codel formalities, his services were terminated. The employees made written complaints with regard to inappropriate behavior of the petitioner, the allegations of the female employee of the company were neither wrong nor fake. It was disputed that some of the employees of the company were corrupt. The services of the petitioner were terminated during the probation period and prayed for the dismissal of the petition/ application.

4. Petitioner filed rejoinder in which he denied the preliminary objections and reiterated the averments as made in the statement of claim.

5. On the pleadings, this Court formulated the following issues on 10.11.2022.

1. Whether the termination of the services of the petitioner w.e.f. 12.03.2022 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is illegal and unjustified? If yes, what relief the petitioner is entitled to? . . .OPP.
2. Whether the claim petition is neither competent nor maintainable in the present form, as alleged? . . .OPR.
3. Relief

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. Before proceeding further, it is pertinent to mention here that when the case was listed for the cross-examination of the petitioner, respondent failed to appear before this court despite notice and was proceeded against ex-parte *vide* order dated 23.04.2024.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

Issue No.1 : No. Not entitled to any relief.

Issue No.2 : Yes.

Relief : Application is answered in negative as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issues No.1 & 2

9. Both these issues are interlinked and inter-connected and can be disposed off by the same amount of discussion of evidence on record, as such both issues are taken up together. The onus to prove issue no. 1 is on the petitioner and issue no. 2 is on the respondent.

10. Coming to evidence led by the petitioner, petitioner has stepped into the witness box as PW-1 and led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the petition. He also placed on record letter dated 27.10.2021 Ex. PW-1/B, warning letter Ex. PW-1/C, termination letter Ex. PW-1/D, whatsapp messages Mark PA and PB, copy of demand notice Mark-PC, 2nd demand notice Mark-PD, copy of complaint Mark-PE and copy of OPD Slip of PGI Chandigarh Mark-PF.

11. Other witness examined by the petitioner Sh. Rakesh Kumar as PW-2, who deposed that he is posted as Labour Inspector at Baddi since 23.02.2023. He deposed that petitioner had filed a complaint Ex. PW-2/A which was received by him through CM Portal. He also placed on record failure report Ex. PW-2/B, statement of petitioner which was recorded during conciliation proceedings Ex. PW-2/C.

12. This is the entire evidence which has been led by the petitioner.

13. Before adverting any further it would be apposite to venture in to the legal aspect of the matter, as to whether the petitioner would fall within the terms of section 2(s) of the Act. The Section reads as under:

“Workman” means any person (including an apprentice employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person-

- (i) who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957); or
- (ii) who is employed in the police service or as an officer or other employee of a prison; or
- (iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or
- (iv) who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding one thousand six hundred rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, function mainly of a managerial nature.]

14. The definition itself stipulates as to who a workman would be. However, clause-1 to IV are the exceptions which have been carved out to say that the following would not fall within the category of a “workman”. The bare reading of the section shows that a person who is employed in a managerial or administrative capacity would not fall within the term of workman and the person who is employed in a supervisory capacity and draws wages exceeding ₹ 10,000/- per mensem and discharge function mainly of a managerial nature would also not come within the purview of the term “workman”.

15. Viewed in this context, a bare reading of the claim as well as reply goes to show that the petitioner was working as Senior Executive Accounts Manager with the respondent company. No other document has been placed on record by the petitioner to show that he was discharging any other duties or was doing any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational and clerical work.

16. From the evidence, on record, it is quite clear that the petitioner was employed in managerial capacity and was drawing wages more than ₹ 10,000/- per mensem. Though, in determining the nature of work, the designation of the employee or the name assigned to him should not be given due importance, and the primary duty performed by the person is to be given due importance but coming to the case in hand there is no evidence worth the name to suggest that the petitioner was doing manual, skilled, unskilled, technical, operational or clerical work in the respondent company. **In Somnath Tulshi Ram Galande Vs. Presiding Officer, Hind Labourt Court Pune and others 2008 (4) Mh.L.J 163, the Hon’ble Apex Court has held as under:**

“Where a particular workman is a supervisor within or without the definition of “workman” is “ultimately a question of fact, at best one of mixed fact and law” and “will really depend upon the nature of the industry, the type of work in which he is engaged, the organizational set up of the particular unit of industry and the like factors.”

17. The Hon’ble High Court had come to record a finding in the aforesaid case that the appellant therein was undertaking supervisory and managerial work as such he was not covered under the definition of “workman”.

18. The petitioner has not bothered to plead or to prove the character and nature of his duties. Thus, from the evidence as available on record it can be concluded that the petitioner was not a workman as defined under Section 2(s) of the Act.

19. In view of the discussion made hereinabove the petitioner has not led any evidence to show that the work he actually was performing, was not in supervisory/managerial capacity. The plea of the respondent that the petition is not maintainable has to be accepted as the

petitioner does not fall under the definition of Section 2(s) of the Act. Accordingly, issue no. 1 decided against the petitioner, whereas issue no. 2 is decided in favour of the respondent.

Relief.

20. In view of my findings on issues no.1 & 2, above, the claim petition filed by the petitioner under Section 2-A & 33(C) of the Act, fails and is hereby dismissed by holding that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed.

21. Let a copy of this award be communicated to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. The file after due completion be tagged with the main case file.

Announced in the open Court today on this 18th day of November, 2024.

Sd/-

(ANUJA SOOD)

*Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial
Tribunal, Shimla, H.P.*

**IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 141 of 2004

Instituted on : 29.03.2005

Decided on : 27.11.2024

Chatter Singh, S/o Sh. Gurdia Ram, C/o Sh. J.C. Bhardwaj, President H.P. (A.I.T.U.C) H.Q. Saproon, District Solan, H.P.

. .Petitioner .

Versus

The Executive Engineer, H.P.S.E.B. Div. Rajgarh, District Sirmour, H.P. . .Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Sh. M.L. Sharma, Advocate

For the respondent : *Ex-part*

AWARD

The following reference was received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:

“Whether the removal from daily wage of Sh. Chatter Singh, S/o Sh. Gurdia Ram, w.e.f. 12.03.1997 by the Executive Engineer, H.P.S.E.B. Division Rajgarh, District Sirmaur, H.P. vide his order dated 14.03.1997 is legal and justified? If not, what seniority, service benefit and relief the concerned workmen is entitled to?”

2. Before proceeding further, I deem it appropriate to point out here that the reference was received by this Court in the year 2004 and notice was issued to the respondent. Respondent appeared in the Court and thereafter the claim was filed by the petitioner to which the respondent filed reply and issues were struck off vide order dated 27.06.2006. The matter was finally decided by this Court vide award dated 04.03.2010 whereby the claim of the petitioner was allowed and the petitioner was ordered to be reinstated in service along-with seniority and continuity but without any back-wages. After passing of award dated 4.3.2010, the respondent challenged the same by filing CWP No. 2032 of 2010, which was disposed off by the Hon'ble Single Judge of Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh by modifying the award to the extent denying benefits of seniority and continuity to the workman in service. The petitioner challenged the judgment of Hon'ble Single Judge by filing LPA No. 71 of 2015. Respondent also challenged the judgment of Hon'ble Single Judge by filing LPA No. 144 of 2016. Both the LPA's were taken up by the Hon'ble Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court of HP and were disposed off vide order dated 12.03.2024 whereby the matter was remanded back to this Court for fresh adjudication with directions to consider the pleadings of all the parties and the documents filed by them which are already on record or which they seek to place on record and then pass a reasoned award in accordance with law by 30.11.2024. After receipt of the case file, notices were issued to the parties in pursuance thereof Shri J.C Bhardwaj, AR appeared for the petitioner, whereas non appeared for respondent and respondent was proceeded against ex-parte vide order dated 24.04.2024.

3. The assertions as made in the claim petition filed by the petitioner are that he was employed in the respondent board somewhere during the month of June, 1981 and his services were illegally terminated on 12.03.1997. The petitioner had completed 240 working days in the years 1981 and 1982 but he was given fictional and artificial breaks by the respondent with the intention to evading the provisions of Section 25-B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (**hereinafter to be referred as the Act**). The Hon'ble High Court of H.P in CWP No. 2207/95 has clearly held that the petitioner had worked for more than 240 days in each calendar year during his service tenure and he was allowed to continue on the same post which he was holding before his termination on 16.10.1995 as such the matter regarding working days till the year 1995 cannot be re-opened by the respondent being barred by resjudicata. The petitioner was employed for some time and then he was removed from service on 12.03.1997 on false and fabricated grounds by serving notice dated 01.05.1996 regarding absence from duties since 16.1.1996 and thereafter another notice dated 17.12.1996 was served to the petitioner and his services were finally terminated on 12.03.1997. The Executive Engineer declined the regularization of the petitioner on the false ground which was created by him. The petitioner was never served with proper chargesheet regarding the alleged misconduct of absence nor any notice of enquiry was served upon the petitioner. No enquiry was conducted against the petitioner and his services were terminated in violation of Sections 25-F/N of the Act. It is claimed that the petitioner has worked for more than 240 at the beginning within twelve calendar months. The juniors of petitioner have been retained whereas services of petitioner have been terminated illegally. The sudden removal of the petitioner from employment has made his integrity doubtful in the eyes of one and all. The petitioner is stated to be unemployed and prayed for reinstatement with retrospective effect from the date of his illegal termination along-with all consequential benefits.

4. Notice of this claim was sent to the respondent and in pursuance thereof the respondent filed reply wherein they took preliminary objections regarding cause of action, no legal or vested right of the petitioner have been infringed or violated, barred by delay and laches, estoppel, abandonment and petitioner is guilty for filing the wrong affidavit before the Hon'ble High Court. It is averred that the petitioner was engaged as beldar w.e.f. 17.07.1981 and not from June 1981 and he worked upto 15.10.1995 and thereafter he abandoned the job willfully and most of period absconded himself e.g for 207 days in 1981, 165 days in 1982, 365 days in 1983 (absented for full year during 1983), 357 days in 1984 and 361 days during 1985 i.e for eight years and worked only for six days during 1984. Thus, he absented himself 359 days during 1994 and worked only for one month during 1995 whereas his absence during 1995 comes for 335 days. The services of the petitioner were disengaged by the respondent w.e.f. 12.03.1997 as the petitioner is habitual of suppressing material facts about his long absence during his entire service period w.e.f. 17.07.1981 to 15.10.1995. Petitioner had worked only for 406 days during this duration and thereafter when the petitioner was reengaged w.e.f. 20.12.1995 to 15.01.1996, he remained absent for eight months but no response from the petitioner was received despite having been afforded sufficient opportunities as per communications/notices dated 1.5.1996, 2.9.1996, 3.9.1996, 10.10.1996 and 17.12.1996 and thereafter the office incharge of the petitioner recommended the case of the petitioner for termination vide memo dated 28.1.1997. It is averred that the termination of the petitioner had not been held wrong by the respondent in communication dated 12.3.1997 and the case of appointment of T-mate work charge was inadvertently approved by the respondent, however, the same has been deleted vide office order dated 26.3.1999. The conduct of the petitioner during his service was undesirable and his omission and commissions during the service period cannot be condoned as such he is not fit for Board service. On merits, it is averred that the petitioner was re-engaged by the respondent on the basis of order dated 20.12.1995, passed by the Hon'ble High Court of HP. The action of the respondent in disengaging the services of the petitioner on account of misconduct for long absence and non-submission of reply of notices is stated to be legal and bonafide. Petitioner had not completed 240 days in any calendar year and prayed for the dismissal of the claim.

5. Rejoinder was filed in which the averments made in the reply were denied and those in the claim petition were re-affirmed.

6. On the pleadings, this Court formulated the following issues on 27.06.2006

1. Whether the services of the petitioner have been illegally terminated by the respondent w.e.f. 12.03.1997? If so, its effect? .. *OPP.*
2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative, to what relief of service benefits the petitioner is entitled to? .. *OPP.*
3. Whether the present petition is not maintainable and is also barred by limitation? .. *OPR.*
4. Relief.

7. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

8. I have heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties and have also gone through the record with care.

9. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| Issue No.1 | : | Yes |
| Issue No.2 | : | Entitled to reinstatement with seniority and continuity but without back-wages. |
| Issue No.3 | : | No |
| Relief | : | Reference is answered partly in affirmative as per operative part of the Award. |

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issues No.1 & 2.

10. Both these issues are intermingled and inter-connected and require common appreciation of the evidence, as such both these issues are taken up together for the purpose of determination.

11. The onus to prove issue no.1 is on the petitioner. In support of his case, petitioner stepped into the witness box as PW-1 to depose that he was engaged as beldar by the respondent in 1981 and his services were terminated by the respondent in the year 1995. After his termination, he approached the Hon'ble High Court and he was re-instated by the order of the Hon'ble High Court. He had completed 240 working days prior to his removal in 1995. He was removed from service by the respondent on 12.3.1997 and thereafter he had approached the Hon'ble High Court and then he was reinstated by the order of the Hon'ble High Court. He had completed 240 days prior to his removal in 1995. He was removed by the respondent on 12.03.1997 and thereafter he approached the Tribunal where he was directed to approach this Court *vide* Ex. PA. He had raised the demand notice Ex. PB. When he received the notice from the respondent he had gone to resume his duties but he was not permitted to resume his duties. He was terminated by the respondent vide office order Mark Z-1. No notice or compensation was given/paid to him at the time of his termination. No enquiry had been held against him at the time of his termination.

12. During cross-examination, he deposed that he worked regularly from 1981 to 1995. He denied that he had not worked from 21.08.1995 to 15.9.1996. He further denied that he had worked for 17 days in September, 1996. He denied that he had not joined his duties after 15.09.1996. Self-stated that he had approached the department many times. He also denied that since he was not attending his duties, he was removed.

13. This is the entire evidence led by the petitioner.

14. In order to rebut the evidence of the petitioner, respondent examined Shri K.S Banyal, as RW-1, who deposed that the petitioner was engaged as beldar on daily wage basis w.e.f. 1.6.1981 to 15.10.1995 and then he abandoned the job at his own. In pursuance to order passed by the Hon'ble High Court, the petitioner joined his duties on 16.12.1995 and worked for 26 days till 15.1.1996 and then the petitioner made default in appearance and subsequently joined in 8/96 and continued uptill 15.9.1996 and thereafter abandoned the job at his own. The respondent served letter to the petitioner to join his duties but in vain and then the services of the petitioner were retrenched vide notice Ex. RA but without compensation. The petitioner had not completed 240 working days in twelve calendar months preceding his termination.

15. During cross-examination, he deposed that the petitioner was never chargesheeted by the respondent. He denied that the petitioner was not retrenched but dismissed on the ground of misconduct. This witness has expressed his ignorance that whether the services of juniors to the petitioner have been regularized or not.

16. This is the entire evidence led by the respondent

17. So far as the case set up by the petitioner is concerned, it is evident from Ex. PX that the matter was taken up by the Hon'ble High Court and vide judgment dated 08.01.1996, the termination of the services of the petitioner was held to be illegal. The Hon'ble High Court has held as under:

“Petitioner states that he was employed on daily wage basis as beldar in November, 1980. In October, 1995, his wife suffered burn injuries. He applied for leave for three days from 15.10.1995 to 17.10.1995 to get her medically examined. But his services were dispensed with on 16.10.1995. The petitioner had put in more than fourteen years' service when his services were dispensed with. There is no compliance of Section 25-F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in this case. Thereafter, termination of services of the petitioner is illegal. Petitioner could avail of leave to this extent in one spell for every three months of service under Clause 12(m)(i) of Standing Orders framed under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 with respect to all workmen employed in the industrial establishment and covered under the Factories Act, 1948.

In view of the aforesaid ground, termination of petitioner's services is illegal and, therefore, is set aside. The petitioner will continue in service and his case for regularization be considered in accordance with the policy of the Board since he has put in more than fourteen years of service. He will be deemed to be in continuous service of the Board and the period of break in service will be counted for the purpose of continuity of service, but no monetary benefit is allowed to him.”

18. Thus, it is clear from the aforesaid order passed by the Hon'ble High Court, that the petitioner was ordered to be deemed in continuous service and the period of break in service was ordered to be counted for the purpose of continuity of service. Aforesaid order dated 8.1.1996 of Hon'ble high Court of H.P., makes it clear that the petitioner was held to be in continuous service. Since, the matter stands settled by the Hon'ble High Court that the petitioner was in continuous service of the respondent board as such the question of completion of 240 working days in twelve calendar months for the aforesaid period, cannot be re-opened at this stage. The respondent has not challenged the judgment dated 08.01.1996, which has now attained finality.

19. The respondent has taken the plea that the petitioner had abandoned the job on his own and he was not reporting for duty as such his services were dispensed vide notice Ex. RA. The stand taken by the respondent is that despite numerous letters and notices issued to the petitioner, he had not resumed his duties but such letters and notices have not been produced on record by the respondent in accordance with law. Otherwise also as per judgment Ex. PX, the petitioner was held to be in continuous service without any break since 1981 as such the respondent could not have dispensed with the services of the petitioner without complying the provisions of the Act. It is well known that abandonment has to be proved by the employer like any other fact. Therefore, the burden of proving of abandonment is upon the respondent. It has been laid down by our own Hon'ble High Court in case titled as *Narain Singh vs. The State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors., 2016 (3) Him L.R. 1875* that voluntary abandonment of work by a workman is required to be established by way of cogent and reliable evidence by the employer. Similarly, in case titled as

State of Himachal Pradesh & another vs. Shri Partap Singh, 2017 (1) Him L.R. 286, it has been held by our own Hon'ble High Court that abandonment is not to be lightly presumed, but it has to be unequivocally proved by the employer. Simply because a workman fails to report for duty, it cannot be presumed that he has left/abandoned the job. Admittedly, no disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the petitioner by the respondent for his alleged willful absence from duty. Absence from duty is a serious misconduct and the principle of natural justice did require that some sort of a fact finding inquiry was got conducted by the respondent. In the present case as it emerges from the evidence on record, so was not done by the respondent. Then, '*animus*' to abandon, it is well settled, must necessarily be shown to exist, before a case of abandonment can be said to have been made out. No evidence of any such '*animus*' on the part of the petitioner is forthcoming in the present case. Thus, the plea of abandonment put forth by the respondent/employer is not established.

20. It is also the case of the respondent that the services of the petitioner have been terminated vide notice Ex. RA. From the perusal of notice Ex. RA, it is clear that the respondent had terminated the services of the petitioner by exercising the powers conferred by the Standing Orders framed under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 and covered under the Factory Act, 1948 mentioning therein that the conduct of Shri Chatar Singh which lead to his prolong absence is such as to render his further retention in the public service undesirable in spite of numerous letters and notices issued vide this office letter dated 3.9.1996, 10.10.1996 and 17.12.1996. It is also clear from the notice Ex. RA that no compensation was paid to the petitioner at the time of his termination. From the aforesaid notice, it is clear that the services of the petitioner have been terminated by the respondent on account of his alleged absence but before terminating his services neither any chargesheet was issued to him nor the respondent had conducted any enquiry against him. The **Hon'ble Supreme Court in 1993 (1) SC Service Law Judgments 222**, has held that :

“Where there is retrenchment on the basis of absence from duty, a reasonable opportunity be given to the employee concerned to put forth his case and proper enquiry be held before terminating his services.”

21. In view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, I am of the firm opinion that without affording any reasonable opportunity to the petitioner to put forth his case, his services have been illegally terminated by the respondent vide notice Ex. RA. Therefore, the notice Ex. RA is set aside and quashed. The petitioner is held entitled for reinstatement with seniority and continuity.

22. Now, the last question which has been raised by the petitioner through this claim petition is that he is not only entitled for reinstatement with seniority and continuity but also for back-wages. The petitioner in his evidence as PW-1 has not uttered even a single word that he is not gainfully employed after his termination. It is settled that the entitlement of any employee to get re-instated does not necessarily and mechanically result in payment of full or partial back-wages which is independent of re-instatement and host of factors like the manner and method of selection and appointment, nature of appointment whether ad-hoc, short term, daily wage, temporary and permanent in character and length of service, which the workman had rendered with the employer, are required to be taken into consideration before passing any order for award of back-wages. This position was reiterated in **Kanpur Electricity Supply C. Ltd. Vs. Shamim Mirza (2009) 1 SCC 20** as well as in **Ritu Marbles Vs. Prabhankant Shukla (2010) 2 SCC 70**.

23. In the case in hand the petitioner has failed to show that he was not gainfully employed anywhere. In **Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan Versus S.C. Sharma (2005) SCC 363**, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that the question of determining the entitlement of a person to back wages is

concerned, the employee has to show that he was not gainfully employed. The initial burden is on the employee to prove that. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **National Gandhi Musuem Vs. Sudhir Sharma (2-21) 12 SCC 439** has considered this aspect and held as under:

“Whether an employee after dismissal from service was gainfully employed is something, which is within his special knowledge. Considering the principle incorporated in Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act, the initial burden is on the employee to come out with the case that he was not gainfully employed after the order of termination. It is a negative burden, however, in what manner the employee can discharge the said burden will depend upon peculiar facts and circumstances of each case. It all depends on the pleadings and evidence on record. Since it is a negative burden, in a given case, an assertion on oath by the employee that he was unemployed, may be sufficient compliance in the absence of any positive material brought on record by the employer.”

24. Coming to the case in hand, since the petitioner has failed to discharge the initial burden put on him to show that he is not gainfully employed anywhere after his illegal termination as such he is not entitled to any back-wages. Both these issues are answered partly in favour of the petitioner.

Issue No.3

25. In support of this issue, no evidence has been led by the respondent which could go to show that as to how the present petition is not maintainable and is also barred by limitation. This objection, to my thinking, appears to be ill conceived. The question of delay and laches was considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as **Ajayab Singh vs. Sirhind Co-operative Marketing-cum-Processing Society Limited and Another, (1999) 6 SCC 82**, wherein it was inter-alia held:

“The provisions of Article 137 of Limitation Act, 1963 are not applicable to the proceeding under the ID Act. The relief under the ID Act cannot be denied merely on the ground of delay. The plea of delay if raised by the employer is required to be proved as a matter of fact by showing the real prejudice and not as a merely hypothetical defence. No reference to the Labour Court can be generally questioned on the ground of delay alone”.

26. In view of the aforesaid binding precedent, it cannot be said that the petition is hit by the vice of delay and laches as such the issue in question is answered against the respondent.

Relief.

27. As a squitter, to my foregoing discussion and findings on issues no. 1 to 3 above, the claim filed by the petitioner succeeds and is hereby partly allowed.

28. **Resultantly, the respondent is directed to re-engage the petitioner along-with seniority and continuity but without back-wages.** The reference sent by the appropriate government is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to records. Ordered accordingly.

Announced in the open Court today this 27th day of November, 2024.

Sd/-

(ANUJA SOOD)

*Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial
Tribunal, Shimla, H.P.*

**IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference No : 196 of 2018

Instituted on : 01.12.2018

Decided on : 28.11.2024

Duni Chand, S/o Sh. Parmanand, Village Kharshal, P.O. Ponta, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District
Mandi, H.P. *.Petitioner.*

Versus

The General Manager, S.C. Johnson Products Pvt. Ltd., Unit-1, Sai Road, Baddi, Tehsil
Baddi, District Solan, H.P. *.Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Sh. T.K. Verma, Adv.

For the respondent : Sh. Atul Jhingan, A

AWARD

The following reference was received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:

“Whether dismissal of the services of Sh. Duni Chand, S/o Sh. Parmanand, Village Kharshal, P.O. Ponta, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, (H.P.), after conducting domestic enquiry, vide letter dated 08.08.2017 with immediate effect by the management of M/s S.C. Johnson Products Pvt. Ltd., Unit-1, Sai Road, Baddi, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P., without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, reinstatement, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above ex-worker is entitled to from the above employer/ management?”

2. In nutshell, the case set up by the petitioner is that he was initially appointed as worker/ operator under the respondent no. 2 on 15.03.1996 and continued to work up till 16.05.2017. Thereafter, the services of the petitioner were suspended by the respondent on 16.05.2017 on false allegations without compliance with the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter to be referred as the Act. The respondent has indulged in unfair labour practice and always had a vindictive attitude towards the petitioner. The respondent on the false allegation has dismissed the services of the petitioner on 08.08.2017. The work and conduct of the petitioner always remained up to mark to the concerned officials of the respondent. Number of efficiency certificates, award and promotions were given to the petitioner by the respondent. The petitioner was suspended *vide* notice dated 16.05.2016 without giving any opportunity of being heard. The allegations leveled in the notice were false and without any base. Thereafter, ultimately charge sheet dated 06.04.2016 was served upon the petitioner/ claimant and Sh. Tarun Sharma, was appointed as an enquiry officer by the respondent company. The petitioner/ claimant appeared before the enquiry officer and asked to supply certain documents which were not earlier supplied to the petitioner due to that reason petitioner could not put forth his defense in proper manner but demand of petitioner/ claimant was rejected by the enquiry officer. Petitioner denied all the charges leveled against him in the charge sheet as he had not violated any provisions of the standing orders of the respondent company and also the condition of the service mentioned in the appointment letter. No show cause notice was issued to the petitioner about charges leveled against him in the charge sheet, prior to the appointment of the enquiry officer. Enquiry officer has not conducted the enquiry, fairly as proper opportunity of being heard was not given to the petitioner and principles of natural justice were also violated by the enquiry officer. Petitioner was proceeded against ex-parte by the enquiry officer on 20.10.2016, despite the fact that the petitioner had specifically requested the enquiry officer not to conduct the enquiry in hotel “**I Square**” and to conduct the same in the company, but the request of the petitioner was not accepted and he was proceeded against ex-parte. Even enquiry officer has not bothered to intimate the next date of hearing fixed in the enquiry and he favoured the respondent company directly. The ex-parte enquiry report/ order of the enquiry officer cannot be looked into as he has not acted fairly. Petitioner has completed 240 days in each calendar year. Respondent has engaged junior to the petitioner who are still working in the company. It has been prayed through this claim that order of the dismissal of the services of the petitioner *w.e.f.* 08.08.2017 passed by the respondent company be declared null and void and petitioner be reinstated in the company with all the consequential service benefits with full back wages.

3. The claim of the petitioner has been contested by the respondent by filing reply wherein preliminary objection has been raised qua maintainability. Though it was not disputed by the respondent that the petitioner was employed with the respondent, however, it has been asserted that during the course of the employment petitioner indulged into such Acts which were not only in deviation from the company policies but considered as a serious misconduct of standing orders as applicable to the employee/ petitioner. The petitioner had indulged into multiple instance of misconduct ranging from insubordination, willful dereliction of duty, misbehavior with his superior officers, co-workers and staff and unauthorized absence. Employment of the petitioner was terminated after holding domestic enquiry. The dismissal order of the petitioner is based upon the allegations which were supported by credible evidence presented before the independent enquiry officer who after examining the facts on record found the petitioner guilty. Based on the report filed by the enquiry officer, respondent issued dismissal order dated 08.08.2017 to the petitioner. Subsequent, to the dismissal order, the respondent has paid an amount of Rs. 11,034/- towards full and final dues of the petitioner and deposited the same on 19.12.2017 into the bank account of the petitioner. Additionally, the respondent had deposited an amount of Rs. 81,577/- on account of gratuity payable to the petitioner into his bank account. It is averred that on 20.09.2016, enquiry officer had sought confirmation of all the documents related to the domestic enquiry and petitioner had confirmed receipts of all the documents. Enquiry has been conducted in just, fair and proper

manner. The appointment of the enquiry officer was not disputed by the petitioner. Enquiry officer took every initiative to inform the petitioner regarding the date of hearing, however, the petitioner decided to remain absent from the proceedings, thus the enquiry officer had no recourse, but to pass an ex-parte order and prayed for dismissal of the present claim of the petitioner.

4. Petitioner filed rejoinder in which he denied the preliminary objections and reiterated the averments as made in the statement of claim.

5. On the pleadings, this Court formulated the following issues on 09.03.2020.

1. Whether the termination of the petitioner *w.e.f.* 08.08.2017 is violative of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, as alleged? If so, what relief the petitioner is entitled to? . . . *OPP.*
2. Whether the dismissal of the petitioner has been order after conducting a fair and an impartial enquiry as per the standing orders and after affording due opportunity to the petitioner, as alleged? If so, its effect thereto? . . . *OPR.*
3. Relief.

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. I have heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties and also scrutinize the record of the case carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings on the same are as under:

Issue No. 1 : Yes.

Issue No. 2 : No.

Relief : Reference is answered in affirmative as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issues No.1 & 2.

9. Both these issues are interlinked and inter-connected and can be disposed off by the same amount of discussion of evidence on record, as such both issues are taken up together. The onus to prove issues no.1 is on the petitioner whereas the onus to prove issue no.2 is on the respondent.

10. Ld. Counsel for the respondent had contended with vehemence that enquiry was conducted in accordance with law and as per the principles of natural justice and the charges against the petitioner stood proved and thereafter, on the basis of enquiry report, the services of the petitioner stood dismissed on 08.08.2014. He also contended that enquiry officer had informed date of hearing to the petitioner, but despite that the petitioner did not appear before the enquiry officer

on 20.10.2016 as such the enquiry office had no other option, but to proceed him *ex-parte*. Thereafter, the statement of the witnesses of the management were recorded and enquiry report was submitted.

11. On the other hand learned counsel for the petitioner had argued that the charge sheet which is allegedly to be served upon the petitioner was not accompanied with any document or the list of witnesses. Even, the Enquiry Officer did not explain the procedure to petitioner which was to be followed by him, in order to conduct the enquiry and further enquiry officer did not comply with the provisions of the certified standing orders as well as principle of natural justice. The enquiry proceeding were taken on 07.10.2016 and vide Ex. RW-2/B enquiry was fixed for 20.10.2016 and parties were directed to appear at 10:00 A.M. for further enquiry. However, in the enquiry report it has been mentioned that “on 20.10.2016 the enquiry was taken on fixed time at 3:00 P.M. From the side of the management Sh. Adit Dubey, HR was present. However, the petitioner had not appeared and the enquiry officer awaited one hour till 4:00 P.M., but the petitioner did not appear till 4:00 P.M., and he was proceeded *ex-parte*”. The enquiry was fixed for 20.11.2016 on which date the statements of the management witnesses were recorded and enquiry report thereafter was submitted.

12. Now, in support of averments as made in the claim petition, the petitioner stepped into the witness box as PW-1 and led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the petition. He also placed on record demand notice dated 24.12.2017 Ex. PW-1/B, application mark-PA, gate pass mark-PB, application dated 10.01.2017 mark-PC, complaint dated 11.04.2014 mark-PD, application mark-PE, letter dated 27.11.2016 Ex. PW-1/C, application for enquiry dated 07.05.2018 mark-PF, letter for closing the case mark-PG, application to labour inspect dated 11.06.2018 Ex. PW-1/D, application dated 09.08.2016 mark-PH, application dated 27.08.2016 mark-PJ, application mark-PK, application 27.07.2013 mark-PL, application regarding nonpayment of wages mark-PM and application dated 14.01.2019 Ex. PW/E.

13. During cross-examination, he denied that he had written apology letter dated 14.09.2004 to the respondent management. He denied that he had quarreled with other employees. Though, he has admitted his signature on mark-RB, mark-RC, mark-RD and mark-RE but stated that his signature were obtained forcefully. He denied that vide mark-RX show cause notice was issued to him on 28.03.2016 and further denied that on 06.04.2016 charge sheet mark-RAA was issued to him. He showed ignorance that Tarun Singh, advocate was appointed as enquiry officer. He denied that his signature were obtained during enquiry. He deposed that he was working in the company since 1996. He denied that he had indulging in acts of insubordination and indiscipline during working hours and also remained willfully absent from duty without permission. He showed ignorance that company kept giving him 75% salary even after his suspension. He denied that he was given opportunity to defend himself and enquiry was conducted in fair manner.

14. This is the entire evidence which has been led by the petitioner.

15. In rebuttal, respondent examined Ms. Palvi Chauhan, as RW-1, who also led her evidence by way of affidavit Ex. RW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the reply, she also placed on record her authority letter Ex. RW-1/B, certificate of change of name Ex. RW-1/C, apology letter mark-RA now Ex. RW-1/D, apology letter 03.06.2006 mark-RB now Ex. RW-1/E, another apology letter mark-RC now Ex. RW-1/F, notice dated 26.08.2009 mark-RD now Ex. RW-1/G, another apology 27.08.2009 mark-RE now Ex. RW-1/H, notice mark-RF now Ex. RW-1/J, apology mark-RF now Ex. RW-1/K, another apology mark-RH now Ex. RW-1/L, notice 25.03.2010 mark-RJ now Ex. RW-1/M, report mark-RK now Ex. RW-1/N, report 11.11.2011 mark-RL now Ex. RW-1/O, notice 14.11.2011 mark-RM now Ex. RW-1/P, notice

mark-RN now Ex. RW-1/Q, notice mark-RO now Ex. RW-1/R, notice 28.11.2011 mark-RP now Ex. RW-1/S, advisory mark-RQ and mark-RR now Ex. RW-1/T and Ex. RW-1/U, notice mark-RX now Ex. RW-1/V, complaints mark-RT and mark-RU now Ex. RW-1/W and Ex. RW-1/X, letter 16.03.2016 mark-RV now Ex. RW-1/Y, complaint 17.03.2016 mark-RW now Ex. RW-1/Z, show cause and notice mark-RX and mark-RY now Ex. RW-1/AA and Ex. RW-1/AB, complaint 31.03.2016 mark-RX now Ex. RW-1/AC and appointment of enquiry officer mark-RAB now Ex. RW-1/AD.

16. During cross-examination, she stated that petitioner was engaged on 15.09.1997 as a Senior Team Member. She admitted that no action was taken against the petitioner prior to 2016 but self-stated that notice(s) and advisory(s) were issued to the petitioner. She denied that petitioner had written letter to the management that he was being tortured by co-worker Ram Lal, Prem Lal, Ravi Shankar etc., self-stated that the co-workers had filed complaint against the petitioner.

17. Other witness examined by respondent Sh. Tarun Singh, as RW-2, who also led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. RW-2/A. He deposed that he is advocate by profession. He was appointed as enquiry officer by S.C. Johnson on 23.08.2016 to hold a domestic enquiry against the petitioner. All relevant documents including correspondence, charge sheet and response thereto of the delinquent etc., were supplied to him and he had issued notice to the delinquent employee namely Sh. Duni Chand to participate in the proceeding. He held the enquiry in a fair manner after hearing the parties, examining witnesses and going through the relevant record of the case, the charges against delinquent employee were proved and accordingly he prepared the enquiry report on 28.12.2016. He also placed on record enquiry proceedings Ex. RW-2/B and enquiry report Ex. RW-2/C.

18. During cross-examination, he admitted that on 20.09.2016 proceeding were conducting at 3:00 P.M. He also admitted that next date of hearing was fixed during the proceeding. He also admitted that as per the proceedings dated 07.10.2016 the petitioner was asked to appear on the next date of hearing *i.e* 20.10.2016 at 10:00 A.M. He denied that petitioner had appeared at the venue on 20.10.2016 at 10:00 A.M. and he was not present. He admitted that no notice was issued to the petitioner after 20.10.2016. He admitted that as per the enquiry report he was present at the enquiry venue on 20.10.2016 at 3:00 P.M. Self-stated that petitioner did not appeared till 4:00 P.M.

19. This is the entire evidence led by the respondent.

20. So far as, statement of RW-2 is concerned that he has nowhere stated that petitioner had failed to appear on 20.10.2016 and he was proceeded against *ex-parte*. It is evident from the enquiry proceeding Ex. RW-2/B that the enquiry proceedings were taken on 07.10.2016 and the next date of hearing of enquiry was fixed for 20.10.2016 at 10:00 A.M. It is evident from the enquiry report as well as statement of RW-2 that the enquiry was not taken on 20.10.2016 at 10:00 A.M., rather the same was taken up at 3:00 P.M. It is come in the statement of enquiry officer that he had appeared at the venue on 20.10.2016 at 3:00 P.M. No notice was issued to the petitioner of the changed time or that the enquiry proceedings were to be taken on 20.10.2016 at 3:00 P.M., instead of 10:00 A.M. Thus, it stands established from the record that enquiry proceedings were not taken on 20.10.2016 at 10:00 A.M. and the same were taken of 3:00 P.M. without any information and intimation of changed of the time to the petitioner, thus he was illegally proceeded *ex-parte* on the said date by the enquiry officer. No notice thereafter was issued to the petitioner intimating him next date of hearing and the entire evidence was recorded by the enquiry officer on 20.11.2016 in the absence of the petitioner. Since, the time of the enquiry was changed by the enquiry officer without any information and intimation to the petitioner on 20.10.2016, the order of enquiry officer

proceeding the petitioner ex-parte is illegal and is not sustainable in the eyes of the law. The enquiry officer was duty bound to inform the petitioner about the change of enquiry time or to issue notice to the petitioner intimating next date/time of enquiry, but surprisingly the enquiry officer has proceeded to record the statement of witnesses of the petitioner without affording any opportunity to the petitioner to put forth his case and to cross-examine the management witnesses. In view of the above facts & observations, I hold that the enquiry against the petitioner has not been conducted in a proper and fair manner and has been conducted in violation of the principles of natural justice. Since, the enquiry officer has conducted the enquiry in violation of the principles of natural justice, as such the dismissal of the petitioner *vide* letter dated 8.8.2017 which is based on the enquiry report is held to be illegal and unjustified.

21. In view of my aforesaid discussion, the dismissal order dated 8.8.2017 passed against the petitioner by the respondent is hereby set aside and quashed. Thus petitioner is entitled for reinstatement in service along-with all consequential service benefits such as seniority, continuity and full back-wages from the date of his illegal dismissal. Thus issue no. 1 is answered in affirmative and issue no. 2 is accordingly decided against the respondent.

Relief.

22. As a sequel to my findings on the aforesaid issues, the claim of the petitioner is allowed. Resultantly, the respondent is directed to reinstate the petitioner forthwith with seniority and continuity along-with full back-wages from the date of his illegal termination *i.e w.e.f.* 08.08.2017. The payment of back-wages shall be payable within a period of three months from the date of award, failing which, the same shall carry an interest @ 9% per annum. Consequently, the reference stands answered in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

23. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in official gazette. File, after completion be consigned to records.

Announced in the open Court today on this 28th day of November, 2024.

Sd/-

(ANUJA SOOD)
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial
Tribunal, Shimla, H.P.

ADVOCATE GENERAL, DEPARTMENT HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA-171001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171001 the 20th December, 2024

No. 1-34/2024.— Sanction is hereby accorded to the grant of 10 days earned leave *w.e.f.* 26th December, 2024 to 04th January, 2025 with permission to avail prefix/suffix *i.e.* gazetted holiday and Sunday falling on 25th December, 2024 and 05th January, 2025 in favour of **Sh. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocate General.**

Certified that **Sh. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocate General** would have continued to officiate but for his proceeding on 10 days earned leave and this period will count for continuation of his service.

Certified that **Sh. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocate General** is likely, on the expiry of leave will return for duty to the station from where he proceeds on leave.

Sd/-
(ISHWARI NAND MEHTA),
Sr. Addl. Advocate General,
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.

**ADVOCATE GENERAL, DEPARTMENT HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA-171001**

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171001 the 20th December, 2024

No. 1-19/2024.—Sanction is hereby accorded to the grant of thirteen days earned leave *w.e.f. 16th to 28th December, 2024* with permission to avail Prefix/ suffix *i.e* Second Saturday and Sunday falling on 14th, 15th and 29th December, 2024 in favour of **Ms. Santosh Dogra, Deputy Advocate General.**

Certified that **Ms. Santosh Dogra, Deputy Advocate General** would have continued to officiate but for her proceeding on thirteen days earned leave and this period will count for continuation of her service.

Certified that **Ms. Santosh Dogra, Deputy Advocate General** is likely, on the expiry of leave will return for duty to the station from where she proceeds on leave.

Sd/-
(ISHWARI NAND MEHTA),
Sr. Addl. Advocate General,
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.

**ADVOCATE GENERAL, DEPARTMENT HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA-171001**

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171001 the 20th December, 2024

No. 1-30/2024.— Ex-post facto sanction is hereby accorded to the grant of one day earned leave for **18th December, 2024** in favour of **Ms. Niyati Thakur , Deputy Advocate General.**

Certified that **Ms. Niyati Thakur, Deputy Advocate General** would have continued to officiate but for her proceeding on 01 day earned leave and this period will count for continuation of her service.

Certified that **Ms. Niyati Thakur, Deputy Advocate General** was likely, on the expiry of leave will return for duty to the station from where she proceeded on leave.

Sd/-
(ISHWARI NAND MEHTA),
Sr. Addl. Advocate General,
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.

**ADVOCATE GENERAL, DEPARTMENT HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA-171001**

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171001 the 27th December, 2024

No. 1-22/2024.—Ex-post facto sanction is hereby accorded to the grant of 05 days earned leave *w.e.f.* **21st to 25th November, 2024** in favour of **Sh. Tarun Pathak, Deputy Advocate General.**

Certified that **Sh. Tarun Pathak, Deputy Advocate General** would have continued to officiate but for his proceeding on 05 days earned leave and this period will count for continuation of his service.

Certified that **Sh. Tarun Pathak, Deputy Advocate General** was likely, on the expiry of leave will return for duty to the station from where he proceeded on leave.

Sd/-
(ISHWARI NAND MEHTA),
Sr. Addl. Advocate General,
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.

**ADVOCATE GENERAL, DEPARTMENT HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA-171001**

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171001 the 20th December, 2024

No. 1-22/2024.—Sanction is hereby accorded to the grant of 06 days earned leave *w.e.f.* **23rd to 28th December, 2024** with permission to avail Prefix/suffix *i.e.* Sundays falling on 22nd and 29th December, 2024 in favour of **Sh. Tarun Pathak, Deputy Advocate General.**

Certified that **Sh. Tarun Pathak, Deputy Advocate General** would have continued to officiate but for his proceeding on 06 days earned leave and this period will count for continuation of his service.

Certified that **Sh. Tarun Pathak, Deputy Advocate General** is likely, on the expiry of leave will return for duty to the station from where he proceeds on leave.

Sd/-
(ISHWARI NAND MEHTA),
Sr. Addl. Advocate General,
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.

ब अदालत श्री धर्मपाल, उप-मण्डल अधिकारी (नागरिक), श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट,
जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री राज कुमार पुत्र श्री चौधरी राम, निवासी गांव खुलवीं, डाकघर भाखड़ा, ग्राम पंचायत भाखड़ा,
तहसील श्री नैना देवी जी, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

1. आम जनता,
2. प्रधान, ग्राम पंचायत भाखड़ा, तहसील श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट, जिला बिलासपुर।

विषय.—प्रार्थी की पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत भाखड़ा के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाए जाने बारे कि अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म पंजीकरण करने बारे।

हर खास व आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी श्री राज कुमार ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसने अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत भाखड़ा के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है। अब प्रार्थी अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत भाखड़ा के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है, जोकि इस प्रकार से है:—

| क्र० सं० | नाम | सम्बन्ध | जन्म तारीख |
|----------|--------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1. | सोनिया | पुत्री श्री राज कुमार | 03-08-2012 |

अतः ग्राम पंचायत भाखड़ा, तहसील श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट की जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह तारीख 25-04-2025 को या इससे पूर्व असालतन व वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करें अन्यथा आवेदन-पत्र पर जन्म पंजीकरण आदेश पारित करके सचिव, ग्राम पंचायत भाखड़ा को आगामी कार्यान्वयन हेतु भेज दिया जाएगा।

आज तारीख 24-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / —
(धर्मपाल हि0प्र0से0),
उप-मण्डल अधिकारी (नागरिक),
श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट,
जिला बिलासपुर (हि0प्र0)।

**In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate-cum-Additional Registrar of Marriages
Shri Naina Devi Ji at Swarghat, Distt. Bilaspur (H.P.)**

Rajender Thakur s/o Late Sh. Jai Singh, r/o Village & Post Office Kutehla, Tehsil Shri Naina Devi Ji, Distt. Bilaspur (H.P.).

Versus

1. General Public.
2. Pradhan G.P. Kutehla, Tehsil Shri Naina Devi Ji, Distt. Bilaspur.

Proclamation of marriage as per provision under section 8(3) and 11 of the Registration of Marriages Act, 1996.

Whereas, the above named applicant has made an application under section 8(3) and 11 of the H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996 for registration of his marriage. The applicant Rajender Thakur s/o Late Sh. Jai Singh, r/o Village & Post Office Kutehla, Tehsil Shri Naina Devi Ji, Distt. Bilaspur, H.P. hereinafter called as bridegroom and Smt. Shweta, hereinafter called as bride have submitted affidavits stating therein that both they have solemnized marriage with each other on 10-04-2024 as per Hindu rites and customs, but they have not registered the said marriage anywhere in India till date. The Bride Shweta Devi is the daughter of Sh. Madan Lal, r/o Village Thand-Koliyan, Post Office Saloa, Tehsil Shri Naina Devi Ji, District Bilaspur, H.P. and this is her second marriage. She is divorced from the first marriage and her normal place of residence is Village & Post Office Kutehla, Tehsil Shri Naina Devi Ji, Distt. Bilaspur (H.P.).

Hence, proclamation is hereby made to the respondents, general public and Gram Panchayat Kutehla for inviting the objection, if any. If someone has any objection regarding registration of said marriage, he may appear in this court on or before 24-04-2025, failing which *ex-parte* proceeding will be initiated and the order of the registration of marriage will be prepared and announced.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court on dated 24-03-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate-cum-
Additional Registrar of Marriage,
Shri Naina Devi Ji at Swarghat,
Distt. Bilaspur (H.P.).

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा नं0 : 04 / 2025

किस्म प्रकरण : जन्म पंजीकरण

तारीख पेशी : 16-04-2025

श्रीमती रमा देवी पुत्री श्री तुलसी राम, वासी गांव स्होत्र लाहड, डाकघर वच्छवाई, तहसील थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(3) के तहत जन्म पंजीकरण हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र।

इश्तहार अखबारी व मुश्री मुनादी।

श्रीमती रमा देवी पुत्री श्री तुलसी राम, वासी गांव स्होत्र लाहड, डाकघर वच्छवाई, तहसील थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में असालतन हाजिर होकर प्रार्थना-पत्र मय ब्यान हल्फी पेश करते हुए आवेदन किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 20-11-1959 को गांव स्होत्र लाहड, डाकघर वच्छवाई, तहसील थुरल, ग्राम पंचायत कौना, जिला कांगड़ा में हुआ है, परन्तु अज्ञानतावश उसके जन्म का पंजीकरण स्थानीय ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख में न करवाया गया है। अतः प्रार्थिया इस न्यायालय के माध्यम से अपने जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश ग्राम पंचायत कौना को जारी करवाना चाहती है।

अतः प्रार्थिया का आवेदन स्वीकार करते हुए, इस इश्तहार मुश्री मुनादी द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति या संस्था को उपरोक्त की जन्म तिथि 20-11-1959 के पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर एवं एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 30-04-2025 को हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर व एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर एवं एतराज नहीं सुना जावेगा व उपरोक्त श्रीमती रमा देवी पुत्री श्री तुलसी राम, वासी गांव स्होत्र लाहड, डाकघर वच्छवाई, तहसील थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) की जन्म तिथि को पंजीकृत करने के आदेश उप-स्थानीय पंजीकार, जन्म व मृत्यु, ग्राम पंचायत कौना को पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 26-03-2025 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी
थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

**Before the Marriage Officer-cum-Sub Divisional Officer,
Dheera, District Kangra (H.P.)**

In Ref. :

Anish Kumar s/o Sh. Saroop Chand, resident of Village Baloti, P.O. Dheera, Tehsil Dheera, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) India-176 101

Manisha Devi d/o Sh. Pritam Chand, resident of Vill. Kharouth, P.O. Ballah, Teh. Palampur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)-176 064.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Registration of Marriage under section 16 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954.

An application under section 16 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 has been received by the undersigned from Anish Kumar s/o Sh. Saroop Chand, resident of Village Baloti, P.O. Dheera, Tehsil Dheera, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) India-176 101 and Manisha Devi d/o Sh. Pritam Chand, resident of Vill. Kharouth, P.O. Ballah, Teh. Palampur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)-176 064. The next date has been fixed for 01 May 2025 for objection before this court if any, within 15 days may please be forwarded to this office on 28 April 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer—cum—Sub-Divisional Officer,
Dheera, District Kangra (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Dheera, exercising the Powers of
Marriage Officer, Dheera, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

In Ref. :

Nirmal Singh s/o Late Sh. Sant Ram and Lata Kumari d/o Late Sh. Gian Chand

Versus

General Public

Application under section 16 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 for the Registration of Marriage.

An application under section 16 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 has been received by the undersigned from Nirmal Singh DOB 08-03-1963 s/o Late Sh. Sant Ram, r/o Village Nalehar, P.O. & Tehsil Thural, District Kangra (H.P.) Pin Code 176 107 and Lata Kumari DOB 13-09-1965 d/o Late Sh. Gian Chand, r/o Village Pankhar, P.O. Malan, Tehsil Nagrota Bagwan, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) Pin-176-047 on 22-02-1984 at Village Nalehar, P.O. & Tehsil Thural, District Kangra (H.P.) Pin Code 176 107. If there is any objection on this marriage, the objection in person or through counsel to be submitted to this office on or before 20-05-2025, otherwise the marriage will be registered.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-SDM,
Dheera, District Kangra (H.P.).*

**ब अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील खुण्डियां,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

केस नं० : 02 / B/T / 2025

तारीख पेशी : 26-04-2025

कान्ता देवी पुत्री श्री कपूर सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.—जेरे धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के तहत जन्म तिथि का पंजीकरण करने बारे।

प्रार्थिया कान्ता देवी पुत्री श्री कपूर सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने स्वयं उपस्थित होकर प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 19-03-1966 को हुआ है परन्तु गलती से ग्राम पंचायत खुण्डियां के अभिलेख में उसकी जन्म तिथि दर्ज नहीं हुई है जिसको ग्राम पंचायत खुण्डियां के अभिलेख में दर्ज किया जाना अनिवार्य है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को सुनवाई हेतु बजरिया इश्तहार व मुस्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में किसी प्रकार का उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 26-04-2025 को असालतन या वकालतन पेश होकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा तथा कान्ता देवी पुत्री श्री कपूर सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) की जन्म तिथि दिनांक 19-03-1966 जेरे धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के तहत ग्राम पंचायत खुण्डियां के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, उप-तहसील राजा का तालाब,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती कान्ता देवी पुत्री श्री राम सिंह, निवासी गांव छत्र, डाकघर भमोली, उप-तहसील राजा का तालाब, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0 व हाल पत्नी श्री वलवन्त सिंह पुत्र जय सिंह, गांव ज्योर, डा0 हरनोटा, तहसील ज्वाली, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेरे नियम 13(3) हिमाचल प्रदेश जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती कान्ता देवी पुत्री श्री राम सिंह, निवासी गांव छत्र, डाकघर भमोली, उप-तहसील राजा का तालाब, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0 व हाल पत्नी श्री वलवन्त सिंह पुत्र जय सिंह, गांव ज्योर, डा0 हरनोटा, तहसील ज्वाली, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0 ने प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत करते हुए निवेदन किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 24-10-1972 को गांव व पंचायत छत्र, उप-तहसील राजा का तालाब, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0) में हुआ है जिसे उसका परिवार अज्ञानतावश पंचायत रिकार्ड वतराहण में दर्ज न करवा सका था, जिसे वह अब ग्राम पंचायत छत्र के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 25-4-2025 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हजा में उपस्थित होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है तथा कोई एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में जन्म पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत छत्र के पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 26-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
राजा का तालाब, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

मुकद्दमा : नाम दुरुस्ती

पेशी : 17-04-2025

श्री संतोष कुमार पुत्र श्री जगन नाथ, निवासी क्यारी, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—दुरुस्ती नाम हि0 प्र0 रा0 अधिनियम, की जेर धारा 37(1) के तहत महाल क्यारी में नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा बारे प्रार्थी ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है जिसमें लिखा है कि उसका सही नाम संतोष कुमार पुत्र श्री जगन नाथ है जबकि महाल क्यारी के राजस्व अभिलेख में उक्त नाम श्रीमती संतोष देवी पुत्री श्री जगन नाथ दर्ज है जोकि गलत इन्द्राज हुआ है। प्रार्थी उक्त नाम को दुरुस्त करवाकर महाल क्यारी में संतोष देवी उर्फ संतोष कुमार पुत्र श्री जगन नाथ करवाना चाहता है।

अतः उक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र के सन्दर्भ में उपरोक्त नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे यदि किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में दिनांक 17-04-2025 को दोपहर बाद 2.00 बजे हाजिर आ सकता है। हाजिर न आने की स्थिति में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे और बाद में कोई भी उजर या एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक..... को मेरी मोहर व हस्ताक्षर सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

मुकद्दमा : नाम दुरुस्ती

पेशी : 24-04-2025

श्री विजय सिंह पुत्र श्री सालीग्राम, निवासी महाल नागन, डा0 रेहलू, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—दुरुस्ती नाम हि0 प्र0 रा0 अधिनियम, की जेर धारा 37(1) के तहत महाल नागन में नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा बारे प्रार्थी ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है जिसमें लिखा है कि उसका सही नाम विजय सिंह पुत्र श्री सालीग्राम है जबकि महाल नागन के राजस्व अभिलेख में उक्त नाम विनय कुमार पुत्र श्री सालीग्राम दर्ज है जोकि गलत इन्द्राज हुआ है। प्रार्थी उक्त नाम को दुरुस्त करवाकर महाल नागन में विनय कुमार उर्फ विजय सिंह पुत्र श्री सालीग्राम करवाना चाहता है।

अतः उक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र के सन्दर्भ में उपरोक्त नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे यदि किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में दिनांक 24-04-2025 को दोपहर बाद 2.00 बजे हाजिर आ सकता है। हाजिर न आने की स्थिति में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे और बाद में कोई भी उजर या एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक..... को मेरी मोहर व हस्ताक्षर सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

मुकद्दमा : इन्द्राज जन्म तिथि

पेशी : 24-04-2025

श्री औंकार सिंह पुत्र श्री रणजीत सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर भनाला, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम की जेर धारा 13(3) पुनरावलोकित 1969 के तहत जन्म प्रमाण-पत्र लेने बारे प्रार्थना-पत्र।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा बारे प्रार्थी ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है जिसमें लिखा है कि उसकी बेटी गीतिका समयाल का जन्म 20-08-1986 को गांव भनाला, तहसील शाहपुर में हुआ है, लेकिन अज्ञानतावश जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत भनाला के रिकार्ड में दर्ज न करवा सका है। प्रार्थी उक्त जन्म तिथि को दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः उक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र के सन्दर्भ में यदि आम जनता या अन्य किसी को उक्त जन्म तिथि को ग्राम पंचायत भनाला के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करवाने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में दिनांक 24-04-2025 को दोपहर बाद 2.00 बजे हाजिर आ सकता है। हाजिर न आने की स्थिति में

एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे और बाद में कोई भी उजर या एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक को मेरी मोहर व हस्ताक्षर सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता (द्वितीय श्रेणी),
शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

मुकद्दमा : नाम दुरुस्ती

पेशी : 24-04-2025

श्री पदम नाभ पुत्र श्री डैहंजू, निवासी महाल कुरेला, मौजा नेरटी, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—दुरुस्ती नाम हि0 प्र0 रा0 अधिनियम, की जेर धारा 37(1) के तहत महाल कुरेला में नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा बारे प्रार्थी ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है जिसमें लिखा है कि उसका सही नाम पदम नाभ पुत्र श्री डैहंजू है जबकि महाल कुरेला व अन्य के राजस्व अभिलेख में उक्त नाम पदम नाथ पुत्र श्री डैहंजू दर्ज है जोकि गलत इन्द्राज हुआ है। प्रार्थी उक्त नाम को दुरुस्त करवाकर महाल कुरेला व अन्य में पदम नाथ उर्फ पदम नाभ पुत्र श्री डैहंजू करवाना चाहता है।

अतः उक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र के सन्दर्भ में उपरोक्त नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे यदि किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में दिनांक 24-04-2025 को दोपहर बाद 2.00 बजे हाजिर आ सकता है। हाजिर न आने की स्थिति में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे और बाद में कोई भी उजर या एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक..... को मेरी मोहर व हस्ताक्षर सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh

1. Sh. Vishal Kumar s/o Sh. Sunka Ram, Village Jijwin, P.O. Jijwin, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) aged 33 years old.

2. Archana d/o Chuni Lal, Village Powari, P.O. Shonthong, Tehsil Kalpa, District Kinnaur (H.P.) aged 27 years old . . Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Sh. Vishal Kumar s/o Sh. Sunka Ram, Village Jijwin, P.O. Jijwin, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) & Archana d/o Chuni Lal, Village Powari, P.O. Shonthong, Tehsil Kalpa, District Kinnaur (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith affidavits in this court under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws Amendment Act, 2001 (49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 10-03-2025 at Santoshi Mata Mandir Ladrou, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur as per Hindu Rites and Customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objections regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 22-04-2025. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 12-03-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Bhoranj,
Distt. Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh**

1. Neeraj s/o Pappu, r/o Nayamatpur Dilawali, Distt. Farukhabad (U.P.) at present c/o Shri Amin Chand, V.P.O. Tarkwari, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) Aged 20 years

2. Rubina d/o Kancha Lamba, c/o Village Anu Kalan, Ward No. 2, House No. 71, P.O. & Tehsil Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) Aged 19 years . . Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice of intended Marriage.

Sh. Neeraj & Rubina have filed an application undersigned under Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in the Court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnized their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file the objections personally or in writing before this Court on or before 02-05-2025. In case no objection is received by 02-05-2025, it will

be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will allowed accordingly.

Issued today on 19-03-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar), Bhoranj,
District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Sh. Kashmir Singh s/o Sh. Dina Nath, r/o Village Tan Amroh, P.O. Amroh, Tehsil Bhoranj,
District Hamirpur (H.P.) .. *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public

.. *Respondent.*

*Application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9(3) of H.P.
Birth and Death Registration Rules, 2003.*

Whereas, Sh. Kashmir Singh s/o Sh. Dina Nath, r/o Village Tan Amroh, P.O. Amroh, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9(3) of H.P. Birth and Death Registration Rules, 2003 alongwith affidavits and other relevant documents for entering of his son Ajay Kumar s/o Sh. Kashmir Singh, r/o Village Tan Amroh, P.O. Amroh date of birth 27-10-1982 which could not be registered in the record of Gram Panchayat Ghukkar.

Now, therefore by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Ajay Kumar s/o Sh. Kashmir Singh, r/o Village Tan Amroh, P.O. Amroh of may submit their objections in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 25-04-2025 at 10.00 A.M., failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar),
Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar), Bhoranj,
District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Smt. Shilpa Kapil w/o Sh. Yogesh Kumar, r/o Village & P.O. Nagrota, Tehsil Bhoranj,
District Hamirpur (H.P.) .. *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9(3) of H.P. Birth and Death Registration Rules, 2003.

Whereas, Smt. Vimla Devi w/o Late Sh. Vishan Dass, r/o Village & P.O. Nagrota, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9(3) of H.P. Birth and Death Registration Rules, 2003 alongwith affidavits and other relevant documents for entering of my daughter in law Shilpa Kapil w/o Sh. Yogesh Kumar, r/o Village & P.O. Nagrota date of death 14-07-2018 could not be registered in the record of Gram Panchayat Palpal.

Now, therefore by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of death Shilpa Kapil w/o Sh. Yogesh Kumar, r/o Village & P.O. Nagrota of may submit their objections in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 25-04-2025 at 10.00 A.M., failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar),
Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Bhoranj,
Distt. Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh**

1. Sh. Punit Kumar s/o Ajay Kumar, Village Rihri, P.O. Karotha, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) aged 25 years old.

2. Gulista d/o Sh. Mohad Iqbal Ahamad, r/o Chini Meel Colony Jaswantpur Nazibabad Biznor (U.P.) aged 30 years old

. . Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Sh. Punit Kumar s/o Ajay Kumar, Village Rihri, P.O. Karotha, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) & Gulista d/o Sh. Mohad Iqbal Ahamad, r/o Chini Meel Colony Jaswantpur Nazibabad Biznor (U.P.) have filed an application alongwith affidavits in this court under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 2001 (49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 15-01-2023 at Village Rihri, P.O. Karotha, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur as per Hindu Rites and Customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objections regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before

this court on or before 02-05-2025. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 21-03-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).*

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

श्री गनेश वी0सी0 पुत्र उजाले वी0सी0, मूल निवासी नेपाल, हाल निवासी वार्ड नं0 2, भजोगी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इशतहार बाबत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

नोटिस बनाम—आम जनता

श्री गनेश वी0 सी0 पुत्र उजाले वी0सी0, मूल निवासी नेपाल, हाल निवासी वार्ड नं0 2, भजोगी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन—पत्र मय शपथ—पत्र गुजारा है कि उनके पुत्र श्री हिमांशू वी0 सी0 का जन्म 17-02-2019 को हुआ है परन्तु ग्राम पंचायत नसोगी के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है, जिसे अब वह दर्ज करवाना चाहते हैं। इस बाबत क्षेत्रीय अभिकरणों से छानबीन करवाई गई तथा पाया गया कि श्री हिमांशू वी0सी0 पुत्र श्री गनेश वी0सी0 की जन्म तिथि 17-02-2019 है, तथा जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे सिफारिश की गई है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को श्री हिमांशू वी0सी0 पुत्र श्री गनेश वी0 सी0 की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 07-05-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा तथा नियमानुसार ग्राम पंचायत नसोगी के जन्म तथा मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

श्री गनेश वी0 सी0 पुत्र उजाले वी0 सी0, मूल निवासी नेपाल, हाल निवासी वार्ड नं0 2, भजोगी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इशतहार बाबत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

नोटिस बनाम—आम जनता

श्री गनेश वी० सी० पुत्र उजाले वी०सी०, मूल निवासी नेपाल, हाल निवासी वार्ड नं० 2, भजोगी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०) ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन—पत्र मय शपथ—पत्र गुजारा है कि उनकी पुत्री सीता वी० सी० का जन्म 17-06-2015 को हुआ है परन्तु ग्राम पंचायत नसोगी के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है, जिसे अब वह दर्ज करवाना चाहते हैं। इस बाबत क्षेत्रीय अभिकरणों से छानबीन करवाई गई तथा पाया गया कि कुमारी सीता वी०सी० पुत्री श्री गनेश वी०सी० की जन्म तिथि 17-06-2015 है तथा जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे सिफारिश की गई है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को कुमारी सीता वी० सी० पुत्री श्री गनेश वी० सी० की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 07-05-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा तथा नियमानुसार ग्राम पंचायत नसोगी के जन्म तथा मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०)

श्री गनेश वी०सी० पुत्र उजाले वी० सी०, मूल निवासी नेपाल, हाल निवासी वार्ड नं० 2, भजोगी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इशतहार बाबत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

नोटिस बनाम—आम जनता

श्री गनेश वी०सी० पुत्र उजाले वी० सी०, मूल निवासी नेपाल, हाल निवासी वार्ड नं० 2, भजोगी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०) ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन—पत्र मय शपथ—पत्र गुजारा है कि उनकी पुत्री दीपा वी० सी० का जन्म 06-07-2017 को हुआ है परन्तु ग्राम पंचायत नसोगी के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है, जिसे अब वह दर्ज करवाना चाहते हैं। इस बाबत क्षेत्रीय अभिकरणों से छानबीन करवाई गई तथा पाया गया कि कुमारी दीपा वी०सी० पुत्री श्री गनेश वी०सी० की जन्म तिथि 06-07-2017 है तथा जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे सिफारिश की गई है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को कुमारी दीपा वी० सी० पुत्री श्री गनेश वी० सी० की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 07-05-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा तथा नियमानुसार ग्राम पंचायत नसोगी के जन्म तथा मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०)

श्रीमती शकुन्तला देवी पुत्री श्री लोबजंग तण्डूप, मूल निवासी फूडा, जिला लाहौल एवं स्पीति, हाल निवासी गांव व डाकघर मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इशतहार बाबत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

नोटिस बनाम—आम जनता

श्रीमती शकुन्तला देवी पुत्री श्री लोबजंग तण्डूप, मूल निवासी फूडा, जिला लाहौल एवं स्पीति, हाल निवासी गांव व डाकघर मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०) ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन—पत्र मय शपथ—पत्र गुजारा है कि उनका जन्म 15-08-1968 को हुआ है परन्तु नगर परिषद् मनाली के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है, जिसे अब वह दर्ज करवाना चाहती हैं। इस बाबत क्षेत्रीय अभिकरणों से छानबीन करवाई गई तथा पाया गया कि श्रीमती शकुन्तला देवी पुत्री श्री लोबजंग तण्डूप की जन्म तिथि 15-08-1968 है तथा जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे सिफारिश की गई है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को शकुन्तला देवी पुत्री श्री लोबजंग तण्डूप की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 07-05-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा तथा नियमानुसार नगर परिषद् मनाली के जन्म तथा मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती वीना देवी पुत्री श्री गोवर्धन, निवासी गांव सोयल, डाकघर हरीपुर मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इश्तहार बाबत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

नोटिस बनाम—आम जनता

श्रीमती वीना देवी पुत्री श्री गोवर्धन, निवासी गांव सोयल, डाकघर हरीपुर मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन—पत्र मय शपथ—पत्र गुजारा है कि उनका जन्म 13-02-1972 को हुआ है परन्तु ग्राम पंचायत सोयल के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है, जिसे अब वह दर्ज करवाना चाहती हैं। इस बाबत क्षेत्रीय अभिकरणों से छानबीन करवाई गई तथा पाया गया कि श्रीमती वीना देवी पुत्री श्री गोवर्धन की जन्म तिथि 13-02-1972 है तथा जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे सिफारिश की गई है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को वीना देवी पुत्री श्री गोवर्धन की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 07-05-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा तथा नियमानुसार ग्राम पंचायत सोयल के जन्म तथा मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, उप तहसील नित्थर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 : 14 / 2025

दिनांक मरजुआ : 24-03-2025

तारीख पेशी : 30-04-2025

उनवान मुकद्दमा : इन्द्राज सेहत नाम

श्री कुलदीप चन्द पुत्र स्व0 श्री अमी चन्द, निवासी गांव दोगरी, डाकघर तान्दी, उप-तहसील नित्थर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

बनाम

आम जनता

फरीकदोयम।

प्रार्थना पत्र.—U/S 35 ता 37 हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत बाबत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

श्री कुलदीप चन्द पुत्र स्व० श्री अमी चन्द, निवासी गांव दोगरी फाटी पलेही, डाकघर तान्दी, उप-तहसील नित्थर, जिला कुल्लू ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के कार्यालय में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र मय शपथ-पत्र व अन्य दस्तावेजों सहित प्रस्तुत किया है। जिसमें वर्णन किया गया है कि उसका नाम राजस्व अभिलेख फाटी पलेही में प्रदीप कुमार पुत्र स्व० श्री अम्बी लिखा गया है जोकि गलत दर्ज हुआ है, जबकि उसका नाम कुलदीप चन्द पुत्र स्व० श्री अमी चन्द है। ग्राम पंचायत कुठेड़ के रिकार्ड आधार कार्ड, बैंक रिकार्ड में कुलदीप चन्द दर्ज है। अब प्रार्थी ने अपना नाम राजस्व अभिलेख फाटी पलेही में प्रदीप कुमार पुत्र स्व० श्री अम्बी के स्थान पर कुलदीप चन्द पुत्र स्व० श्री अमी चन्द दुरुस्त करने के आदेश चाहे हैं।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को राजस्व अभिलेख फाटी पलेही में प्रदीप कुमार के स्थान पर कुलदीप कुमार पुत्र स्व० श्री अमी चन्द दुरुस्त करने बारा कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह असालतन/वकालतन तारीख पेशी 30-04-2025 को प्रातः 10 बजे इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकते हैं। बसूरत गैरहाजिरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर राजस्व अभिलेख फाटी पलेही, उप-तहसील नित्थर में नाम दुरुस्ती दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 29-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील नित्थर, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प्र०)।

In the Court of Executive Magistrate, Anni, District Kullu (H.P.)

Beli Ram

. . Applicant.

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Subject.—Notice under section 37 of Land Revenue Act, 1954, correction of name in Revenue Record.

Sh. Beli Ram s/o Sh. Lal Dass, Village Lot, P.O. Dohad, Tehsil Anni, District Kullu, H.P. has moved an application for correction of his name in revenue record in the office of the undersigned accompanying with an affidavit stating therein that he is owner of the land in Phati Karshaigad of Tehsil Anni, District Kullu. In the application, the applicant has prayed that the entry in revenue record with respect to name is not correct i.e. Fagnu Ram s/o Sh. Lal Dass. The applicant has attached copy of Aadhar Card, Parivar Register alongwith an affidavit wherein the name of the applicant's Name has been shown as Beli Ram s/o Lal Dass.

Hence, the general public is hereby made aware through this notice that if any person or relatives have any objection regarding correction of name in revenue record of said applicant Sh. Beli Ram s/o Sh. Lal Dass instead of Fagnu Ram s/o Lal Dass, then he may file his objection before the undersigned before 28-04-2025 on any working day failing which the *ex-parte* order with regards to correction of name will be passed.

Given under my seal and signature on this 2nd of April, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-

Executive Magistrate,
Anni, District Kullu (H.P.).

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती रूपा कुमारी पुत्री श्री यादव सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर करजां, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इशतहार बाबत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

नोटिस बनाम—आम जनता

श्रीमती रूपा कुमारी पुत्री श्री यादव सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर करजां, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने बराये मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी कुल्लू के माध्यम से इस कार्यालय में अपनी जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे में आवेदन प्रस्तुत किया है कि ग्राम पंचायत करजां में उनकी जन्म तिथि 11-09-1976 दर्ज किया जाए इस बाबत अनुपलब्धता प्रमाण—पत्र District Registrar B & D-cum-Chief Medical Officer Kullu, District Kullu, H.P., ब्यान हल्फिया, स्कूल प्रमाण—पत्र, आधार कार्ड व रिपोर्ट प्रधान ग्राम पंचायत करजां, परिवार नकल, पैन कार्ड व प्रार्थी व गवाहन के लिखित ब्यान से पाया गया कि श्रीमती रूपा कुमारी पुत्री श्री यादव सिंह की जन्म तिथि 11-09-1976 है तथा जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे सिफारिश की गई है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को श्रीमती रूपा कुमारी पुत्री श्री यादव सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर करजां, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश के ग्राम पंचायत करजां के अभिलेख में जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे किसी को आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 05 मई 2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त किसी का कोई भी उजर/एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा तथा नियमानुसार ग्राम पंचायत करजां के अभिलेख में उक्त जन्म तिथि दर्ज कराने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 01 अप्रैल, 2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती अछरी देवी सुपुत्री श्री गोविन्द राम, निवासी पाटी, डाकघर रिस्सा, तहसील सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हि0प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थिया ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र ब्यान हल्फी वमय अन्य कागजात इस आशय से गुजारा है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 01-07-1962 है, जोकि ग्राम पंचायत रोपड़ी के रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज न है, जिसे दर्ज किया जावे।

इस सम्बन्ध में सर्वसाधारण जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थिया की जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत रोपड़ी के रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज करने पर यदि किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अदालत अधोहस्ताक्षरी दिनांक 30-04-2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जा करके नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 29-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत मोहर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री पपू सुपुत्र श्री झूमर, निवासी वार्ड नं0 3, कुनालग, तहसील सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हि0प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र ब्यान हल्फी वमय अन्य कागजात इस आशय से गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 12-11-2013 है, जोकि नगर परिषद् सरकाघाट के रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज न है, जिसे दर्ज किया जावे।

इस सम्बन्ध में सर्वसाधारण जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी के पुत्र की जन्म तिथि नगर परिषद् सरकाघाट के रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज करने पर यदि किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अदालत अधोहस्ताक्षरी दिनांक 30-04-2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जा करके नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत मोहर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत उपमण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, उप-मण्डल सदर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मिसल नं० : 0 / 2025

तारीख मजरूआ : 22-03-2025

तारीख पेशी : 25-04-2025

अंजू देवी पत्नी श्री रमेश चन्द, निवासी गांव बाडी, डाकघर बाडी गुमाणू, तहसील सदर, जिला मण्डी (हि०प्र०) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादीगण।

इश्तहार मुश्ट्री मुनादी/समाचार पत्र बाबत प्रार्थना-पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के तहत मृत्यु तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा उनवानवाला में अंजू देवी पत्नी श्री रमेश चन्द, निवासी गांव बाडी, डाकघर बाडी गुमाणू, तहसील सदर, जिला मण्डी ने इस न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की अधीन धारा 13(3) के अन्तर्गत प्रस्तुत किया है जिसमें वर्णित किया है कि उनकी पुत्री मोनिका उम्र 18 वर्ष जो श्रीमती रचना, निवासी गांव साम्बल, डाकघर पण्डोह, तहसील सदर, जिला मण्डी के घर में रह रही थी, दिनांक 14 अगस्त, 2023 को हुई भारी वर्षा के कारण बादल फटने से घर सहित मलबे के साथ बाढ़ में बह गई थी तथा अथक प्रयास करने उपरान्त भी उसका कोई अता-पता न चल सका है तथा उनका ब्यान है कि उसकी पुत्री मोनिका की मृत्यु दिनांक 14 अगस्त, 2023 को भारी वर्षा के कारण बादल फटने से घर के मलबे के साथ पानी में बहने के कारण हो चुकी है। इस आवेदन के माध्यम से प्रार्थिनी अपनी पुत्री मोनिका, निवासी गांव बाडी, डाकघर बाडी गुमाणू, तहसील सदर, जिला मण्डी, हि० प्र० की मृत्यु दिनांक 14 अगस्त 2023 को नगर निगम मण्डी हि० प्र० के जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

उपरोक्त विचाराधीन मामले में प्रतिवादी आम जनता को इश्तहार समाचार पत्र व राजपत्र के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थिनी अंजू देवी पत्नी श्री रमेश चन्द की पुत्री मोनिका, गांव बाडी, डाकघर बाडी गुमाणू, तहसील सदर, जिला मण्डी, हि०प्र० की मृत्यु दिनांक 14 अगस्त, 2023 को नगर निगम मण्डी, हि०प्र० के जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्टर में दर्ज करने बारे यदि कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 25-04-2025 को असालतन या वकालतन दोपहर 02.30 बजे मेरे न्यायालय में हाजिर आकर अपना पक्ष लिखित या मौखिक पेश कर सकते हैं। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् किसी आपत्ति पर विचार नहीं किया जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 24-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / -
(ओम कान्त ठाकुर, भा०प्र०से०),
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
उप-मण्डल सदर, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)।

**ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, सदर, जिला मण्डी,
हिमाचल प्रदेश**

मिसल नं० : 14 / 2025

तारीख मजरूआ : 15-02-2025

तारीख पेशी : 26-04-2025

दयावन्ती पुत्री श्री मेघ सिंह पुत्र श्री मोती राम, निवासी मोहाल जागर, पटवार व कानूनगो वृत्त पण्डोह, तहसील सदर, जिला मण्डी, हि० प्र० हाल पत्नी श्री निधि सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर हुरला, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि०प्र० प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 37 ता 38 भू—राजस्व अधिनियम, 1957 के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

दयावन्ती पुत्री श्री मेघ सिंह पुत्र श्री मोती राम, निवासी मोहाल जागर, पटवार व कानूनगो वृत्त पण्डोह, तहसील सदर, जिला मण्डी, हि0 प्र0 हाल पत्नी श्री निधि सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर हुरला, तहसील भुन्तर, जिला कुल्लू, हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना—पत्र दायर किया है कि राजस्व मुहाल जागर में मेरा नाम “श्रीमती वन्तू देवी पुत्री श्री मेघ सिंह पुत्र श्री मोती राम” दर्ज है, जोकि गलत दर्ज है जबकि मेरा सही नाम “दयावन्ती” है अतः महोदय जी से निवेदन है कि मैं अपना नाम वन्तू देवी पुत्री श्री मेघ सिंह पुत्र श्री मोती राम से दुरुस्त करवाकर दयावन्ती पुत्री श्री मेघ सिंह पुत्री श्री मोती राम दर्ज करवाना चाहती हूं। जिसकी दुरुस्ती के आदेश पातिर करने की कृपा करें।

प्रार्थना—पत्र में वर्णित प्रार्थिया का नाम दुरुस्त करने बारा आम जनता को गजट राजपत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशन के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थिया का नाम दयावन्ती पुत्री श्री मेघ सिंह पुत्र श्री मोती राम, मुहाल जागर के राजस्व रिकार्ड में दर्ज किये जाने बारा कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह अससालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज इस न्यायालय में दिनांक 26-04-2025 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे उपस्थित होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। निश्चित अवधि के दौरान कोई भी उजर/एतराज न आने की सूरत में आम जनता के विरुद्ध एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी तथा उक्त प्रार्थिया के नाम की दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 27-03-2025 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर न्यायालय द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,

एवं तहसीलदार, तहसील सदर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री मदन लाल, तहसीलदार/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील ननखरी,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती मीरा देवी पुत्री श्री सोहन लाल, निवासी दनेवटी हालाबाद, पत्नी श्री मनी लाल, निवासी नागाधार, डाकघर देलठ, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

उनवान मुकद्दमा.—प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969 के तहत ग्राम पंचायत बगलती के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत करने बारा।

श्रीमती मीरा देवी पुत्री श्री सोहन लाल, निवासी दनेवटी हालाबाद, पत्नी श्री मनी लाल, निवासी नागाधार, डाकघर देलठ, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में एक दरखास्त पेश कर गुजारिश की है कि प्रार्थिया की जन्म तिथि 04-03-1969 व नाम मीरा देवी ग्राम पंचायत बगलती में दर्ज न है इसलिए मैं ग्राम पंचायत बगलती के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि 04-03-1969 व नाम मीरा देवी पंजीकृत करवाना चाहती हूं। आवेदिका ने शपथ—पत्र, नकल परिवार ग्राम पंचायत बगलती प्रस्तुत

कर अनुरोध किया है कि मेरी जन्म तिथि व नाम को सम्बन्धित ग्राम बगलती के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण किया जावे।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म के पंजीकरण का सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत बगलती के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारा कोई एतराज हो तो दिनांक 25-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असागतन/वकालतन हाजिर होकर लिखित व मौखिक एतराज पेश करे अन्यथा उजर/एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में यह समझा जाएगा कि उक्त जन्म के पंजीकरण बारे किसी को कोई एतराज नहीं है तथा सम्बन्धित सचिव ग्राम पंचायत बडाच को जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

मदन लाल,
नायब तहसीलदार/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री मदन लाल, तहसीलदार/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील ननखरी,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती चिमना देवी पुत्री श्री माटु राम, निवासी शलाग, डाकघर खुन्नी, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

उनवान मुकद्दमा.—प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969 के तहत ग्राम पंचायत खुन्नी—पनोली के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत करने बारा।

श्रीमती चिमना देवी पुत्री श्री माटु राम, निवासी शलाग, डाकघर खुन्नी, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में एक दरखास्त पेश कर गुजारिश की है कि प्रार्थिया की जन्म तिथि 01-01-1968 व नाम चिमना देवी ग्राम पंचायत खुन्नी—पनोली में दर्ज न है इसलिए मैं ग्राम पंचायत खुन्नी—पनोली के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि 01-01-1968 व नाम चिमना देवी पंजीकृत करवाना चाहती हूं। आवेदिका ने शपथ—पत्र, नकल परिवार ग्राम पंचायत खुन्नी—पनोली प्रस्तुत कर अनुरोध किया है कि मेरी जन्म तिथि व नाम को सम्बन्धित ग्राम खुन्नी—पनोली के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण किया जावे।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म के पंजीकरण का सम्बन्धित ग्राम खुन्नी—पनोली के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारा कोई एतराज हो तो दिनांक 25-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असागतन/वकालतन हाजिर होकर लिखित व मौखिक एतराज पेश करे अन्यथा उजर/एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में यह समझा जाएगा कि उक्त जन्म के पंजीकरण बारे किसी को कोई एतराज नहीं है तथा सम्बन्धित सचिव ग्राम पंचायत खुन्नी—पनोली को जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

मदन लाल,
नायब तहसीलदार/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री मदन लाल, तहसीलदार/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील ननखरी,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

संतोष कुमार पुत्र श्री मोहर सिंह, निवासी कराल्टा, डाकघर व तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0
प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

उनवान मुकद्दमा.—प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969 के तहत ग्राम पंचायत करांगला के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में मृत्यु तिथि पंजीकृत करने बारा।

संतोष कुमार पुत्र श्री मोहर सिंह, निवासी कराल्टा, डाकघर व तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में एक दरखास्त पेश कर गुजारिश की है कि प्रार्थी की बहन सवित्रु देवी की मृत्यु 15-07-1993 को घर पर ही हुई है परन्तु अभी तक प्रार्थी की बहन सवित्रु देवी की मृत्यु ग्राम पंचायत करांगला में दर्ज नहीं हो सकी। इसलिए मैं ग्राम पंचायत करांगला के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में मृत्यु तिथि 15-07-1993 पंजीकृत करवाना चाहता हूं। आवेदक ने शपथ—पत्र, नकल परिवार ग्राम पंचायत करांगला प्रस्तुत कर अनुरोध किया है कि मेरी बहन की मृत्यु तिथि सम्बन्धित ग्राम करांगला के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण किया जावे।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त मृत्यु के पंजीकरण को सम्बन्धित ग्राम करांगला के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारा कोई एतराज हो तो दिनांक 26-04-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असालतन/वकालतन हाजिर होकर लिखित व मौखिक एतराज पेश करे अन्यथा उजर/एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में यह समझा जाएगा कि उक्त मृत्यु के पंजीकरण बारे किसी को कोई एतराज नहीं है तथा सम्बन्धित सचिव ग्राम पंचायत करांगला को मृत्यु तिथि पंजीकरण करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 26-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

मदन लाल,
नायब तहसीलदार/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री मदन लाल, तहसीलदार/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील ननखरी,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

श्रीमती शकुन्तला देवी पत्नी स्व० श्री दर्शन दास, निवासी शोली, डाकघर शोली, तहसील ननखरी,
जिला शिमला, हि०प्र० प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

उनवान मुकद्दमा.—प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969 के तहत ग्राम
पंचायत शोली के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में मृत्यु तिथि पंजीकृत करने बारा।

श्रीमती शकुन्तला देवी पत्नी स्व० श्री दर्शन दास, निवासी शोली, डाकघर शोली, तहसील ननखरी,
जिला शिमला, हि०प्र० ने इस अदालत में एक दरखास्त पेश कर गुजारिश की है कि प्रार्थिया की सास श्रीमती
टिउली देवी की मृत्यु 05-02-2003 को घर पर ही हुई है परन्तु अभी तक प्रार्थिया की सास श्रीमती टिउली
देवी की मृत्यु ग्राम पंचायत शोली में दर्ज नहीं हो सकी। इसलिए मैं ग्राम पंचायत शोली के जन्म एवं मृत्यु
पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में मृत्यु 05-02-2003 पंजीकृत करवाना चाहती हूँ। आवेदिका ने शपथ—पत्र, नकल परिवार
ग्राम पंचायत शोली प्रस्तुत कर अनुरोध किया है कि मेरी सास की मृत्यु तिथि का सम्बन्धित ग्राम शोली के
रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण किया जावे।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि
किसी को उपरोक्त मृत्यु के पंजीकरण का सम्बन्धित ग्राम शोली के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारा कोई एतराज हो
तो दिनांक 26-04-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असालतन/वकालतन हाजिर होकर लिखित व मौखिक
एतराज पेश करे अन्यथा उजर/एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में यह समझा जाएगा कि उक्त मृत्यु तिथि के
पंजीकरण बारे किसी को कोई एतराज नहीं है तथा सम्बन्धित सचिव ग्राम पंचायत शोली को मृत्यु तिथि
पंजीकरण करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 26-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

मदन लाल,
नायब तहसीलदार/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०)।

**ब अदालत श्री मदन लाल, तहसीलदार/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील ननखरी,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

कृष्णा देवी पुत्री स्व० श्री कांशी राम, निवासी ग्राम टूटू, डाकघर देलठ, तहसील ननखरी, जिला
शिमला, हि०प्र०

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

उनवान मुकद्दमा.—प्रार्थना—पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि०प्र०

कृष्णा देवी पुत्री स्व० श्री कांशी राम, निवासी ग्राम टूटू, डाकघर देलठ, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि०प्र० ने इस अदालत में आवेदन-पत्र गुजार कर अनुरोध किया है कि उसका नाम राजस्व कागजात में खाता नं० 105/229 कित्ता-02, कुल रकबा 00-12-08 है० चक टूटू व खाता नं० 63/155, कित्ता-02, कुल रकबा 00-16-99 है० चक टिकरी पटवार वृत्त देलठ, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला में कागदू देवी दर्ज है जोकि गलत है जिसे वह सम्बन्धित राजस्व माल कागजात में कागदू देवी के स्थान पर कृष्णा देवी दुरुस्त करवाना चाहती है जिस बारे शपथ-पत्र स्वयं सत्यापित कर ब्यान किया है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्ती सम्बन्धित राजस्व कागजात में करने बारा कोई एतराज हो तो दिनांक 26-04-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असालतन/वकालतन हाजिर होकर लिखित व मौखिक एतराज पेश करे अन्यथा उजर/एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में यह समझा जाएगा कि उक्त नाम दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज नहीं है तथा सम्बन्धित गिरदावर हलका को नाम दुरुस्त करने का आदेश पारित कर दिया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 26-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

मदन लाल,
नायब तहसीलदार/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तकलेच, उप-तहसील तकलेच,
जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०)

नं० मुकद्दमा : 09/13B/2024

तारीख दायर : 04-10-2024

श्री नरेंद्र कुमार पुत्र श्री इंद्र देव, निवासी गांव जलिंड, डाकघर धारगौरा, तहसील रामपुर, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

दरखास्त (नाम दुरुस्ती)।

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

यह दरखास्त श्री नरेंद्र कुमार पुत्र श्री इंद्र देव, निवासी गांव जलिंड, डाकघर धारगौरा, तहसील रामपुर, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) ने इस आशय के साथ प्रस्तुत की है कि वादी के मुताबिक आधार कार्ड, पहचान पत्र, पंचायत रिकार्ड में नरेंद्र कुमार पुत्र श्री इंद्र देव दर्ज है जो सही व दुरुस्त है परन्तु माल कागजात चक मझाली के कागजात माल में वादी का नाम बबलू पुत्र इंद्र देव दर्शाया गया है जो सही नहीं है। वादी महाल मझाली के कागजात माल में अपना नाम बबलू पुत्र इंद्र देव के स्थान पर नरेंद्र कुमार पुत्र श्री इंद्र देव दुरुस्त व दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त वादी का नाम माल कागजात में दुरुस्त दर्ज करने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो दिनांक 26-04-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में हाजिर आकर अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई भी

उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार वादी का नाम दुरुस्त करने के आदेश पारित किये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 26-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील तकलेच, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तकलेच, उप-तहसील तकलेच,
जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

नं0 मुकद्दमा : 01 / 13B / 2025

तारीख दायर : 06-01-2025

श्री ग्यारी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री जोबनु, निवासी चौका, डाकघर तकलेच, उप-तहसील तकलेच, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

दरखास्त (नाम दुरुस्ती)।

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

यह दरखास्त श्री ग्यारी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री जोबनु, निवासी चौका, डाकघर तकलेच, उप-तहसील तकलेच, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) ने इस आशय के साथ प्रस्तुत की है कि वादी के मुताबिक आधार कार्ड, पहचान पत्र, पंचायत रिकार्ड में ग्यारी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री जोबनु दर्ज है जो सही व दुरुस्त है परन्तु माल कागजात चक चौका के कागजात माल में वादी का नाम गोपाल सिंह दर्शाया गया है जो सही नहीं है। वादी महाल चौका के कागजात माल में अपना नाम गोपाल सिंह के स्थान पर ग्यारी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री जोबनु दुरुस्त व दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त वादी का नाम माल कागजात में दुरुस्त दर्ज करने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो दिनांक 26-04-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में हाजिर आकर अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई भी उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार वादी का नाम दुरुस्त करने के आदेश पारित किये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 26-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील तकलेच, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तकलेच, उप-तहसील तकलेच,
जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

नं0 मुकद्दमा : 10/13B/2025

तारीख दायर : 04-10-2024

पीताम्बर दत्त पुत्र श्री इंद्र देव, निवासी गांव जलिंड, डाकघर धारगौरा, तहसील रामपुर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

दरखास्त (नाम दुरुस्ती)।

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

यह दरखास्त श्री पीताम्बर दत्त पुत्र श्री इंद्र देव, निवासी गांव जलिंड, डाकघर धारगौरा, तहसील रामपुर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) ने इस आशय के साथ प्रस्तुत की है कि वादी के मुताबिक आधार कार्ड, पहचान पत्र, पंचायत रिकार्ड में कुमारी हेमलता पुत्री श्री पीताम्बर दत्त दर्ज है जो सही व दुरुस्त है परन्तु माल कागजात चक मझाली के कागजात माल में वादी का नाम पिकू पुत्र इंद्र देव दर्शाया गया है जो सही नहीं है। वादी महाल मझाली के कागजात माल में अपना नाम पिकू पुत्र इंद्र देव के स्थान पर पीताम्बर दत्त पुत्र श्री इंद्र देव दुरुस्त व दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त वादी का नाम माल कागजात में दुरुस्त दर्ज करने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो दिनांक 28-04-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में हाजिर आकर अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई भी उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार वादी का नाम दुरुस्त करने के आदेश पारित किये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील तकलेच, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तकलेच, उप-तहसील तकलेच,
जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

नं0 मुकद्दमा : 11/13B/2025

तारीख दायर : 04-10-2024

कुमारी हेमलता पुत्री श्री इंद्र देव, निवासी गांव जलिंड, डाकघर धारगौरा, तहसील रामपुर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

दरखास्त (नाम दुरुस्ती)।

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

यह दरखास्त कुमारी हेमलता पुत्री श्री इंद्र देव, निवासी गांव जलिंड, डाकघर धारगौरा, तहसील रामपुर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) ने इस आशय के साथ प्रस्तुत की है कि वादिया के मुताबिक आधार कार्ड, पहचान पत्र, पंचायत रिकार्ड में कुमारी हेमलता पुत्री श्री इंद्र देव दर्ज है जो सही व दुरुस्त है परन्तु माल कागजात चक मझाली के कागजात माल में वादी का नाम कुमारी रजु पुत्री इंद्र देव दर्शाया गया है जो सही नहीं है। वादिया महाल मझाली के कागजात माल में अपना नाम रजु पुत्री इंद्र देव के स्थान पर कुमारी हेमलता पुत्री इंद्र देव दुरुस्त व दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त वादी का नाम माल कागजात में दुरुस्त दर्ज करने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो दिनांक 28-04-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में हाजिर आकर अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई भी उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार वादी का नाम दुरुस्त करने के आदेश पारित किये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 28-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील तकलेच, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती निरन्जना पत्नी स्व0 श्री सुरेश, वासी बलैया, ग्राम पंचायत टियाली, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता एवं ग्राम पंचायत टियाली, तहसील ठियोग, विकास खण्ड ठियोग प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—जन्म/मृत्यु तिथि प्रविष्टि बारा।

इस अदालत में अतिरिक्त जिला रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु शिमला, जिला शिमला के कार्यालय पृष्ठांकन संख्या 1278, दिनांक 28-02-2025 के माध्यम से प्राप्त दस्तावेज क्रमशः (1) जिला पंजीकरण (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी पत्र संख्या एच0एफ0एल0/जन्म एवं मृत्यु/एस0टी0/2025-2-1276, दिनांक 28-02-2025, (2) शपथ-पत्र आवेदिका, (3) शपथ-पत्र वाशिन्दगान देह, (4) जन्म रिपोर्ट, (5) अप्राप्यता प्रमाण-पत्र, (6) आधार कार्ड व शपथ-पत्र श्री दीप राम पुत्र मोती राम, निवासी बलैया, डाकघर टियाली, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला हि0 प्र0 व श्री हरी राम पुत्र मोहतु, ग्राम बलैया, डा0 टियाली, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 अपने जुड़वां बच्चों की जन्म तिथि किन्हीं कारणों से पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने से रह गई है। परिणामतः पंचायत के जन्म पंजीकरण एवं मृत्यु रजिस्टर में आवेदिका श्रीमती निरन्जना पत्नी स्व0 श्री सुरेश, वासी बलैया, ग्राम पंचायत टियाली, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला, हि0 प्र0 अपने जुड़वां बच्चों की जन्म तिथि दर्ज न हुई है जो नियमानुसार है। इस विषय की पुष्टि शपथ-पत्र व जारी जन्म/मृत्यु रिपोर्ट जो जन्म/मृत्यु अधिकारी शिमला ने अपने आदेश-पत्र जो दिनांक 28-02-2025 को जारी हुआ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि श्रीमती निरन्जना पत्नी स्व0 श्री सुरेश, वासी बलैया, ग्राम पंचायत टियाली, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) के अपने जुड़वां बच्चों पुत्र समर की जन्म तिथि 15-02-2012 व पुत्री संजना की जन्म तिथि 15-02-2012 जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण

अधिनियम 1969 की धारा 13(3) के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत पंचायत से सम्बन्धित अभिलेख अथवा जिला शिमला पंजीकरण (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किये जाने हैं। अगर किसी को इस सम्बन्ध में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस अदालत में नोटिस (इश्तहार) के जारी होने के एक माह के भीतर अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि में आपत्ति न आने की सूरत में आवेदिका श्रीमती निरन्जना पत्नी स्व० श्री सुरेश, वासी वलैया, ग्राम पंचायत टियाली, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) के जुड़वां बच्चों पुत्र समर की जन्म तिथि 15-02-2012 व पुत्री संजना की जन्म तिथि 15-02-2012 की जन्म तिथि सम्बन्धित अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश ग्राम पंचायत सचिव टियाली को पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 05-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०)।

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Bhanu Pratap s/o Shri Anuj Kumar, r/o Village & P.O. Fancha, Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh.

Through his Father

Sh. Anuj Kumar s/o Sh. Ram Krishan, r/o Village and P.O. Fancha, Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla, H.P.
.. Applicant.

Versus

General Public

.. Respondent.

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant Sh. Anuj Kumar have made an application before me regarding correction of his son name as **BHANU PRATAP** (D.O.B. 23-03-2017) in place of **VIHAN** (D.O.B. 23-03-2017) in the records of "AADHAR" card and other relevant documents which is pertaining to Bhanu Pratap s/o Shri Anuj Kumar, r/o Village & P.O. Fancha, Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh.

Now, therefore, objection are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to proposed correction of applicant son name as **BHANU PRATAP** in place of **VIHAN**, they should appear before the undersigned on or before 20-04-2025 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard and name will be entered accordingly.

Issued today on 22nd day of the March, 2025 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal.

Sd/-
(NISHANT TOMAR, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Akrtika d/o Shri Pradeep Kumar, r/o Village Nintha, P.O. & Sub-Tehsil Nithar, District Kullu, Himachal Pradesh.

Through her Father

Sh. Pradeep Kumar s/o Sh. Gulab Chand, r/o Village Nintha, P.O. & Sub-Tehsil Nithar, District Kullu, Himachal Pradesh. . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant Sh. Pradeep Kumar have made an application before me regarding correction of his daughter name as **AKRTIKA** in place of **AKRITI** in the records of "AADHAR" card and other relevant documents which is pertaining to Akrtika d/o Shri Pradeep Kumar, r/o Village Nintha, P.O. & Sub-Tehsil Nithar, District Kullu, Himachal Pradesh.

Now, therefore, objection are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to proposed correction of applicant daughter name as **AKRTIKA** in place of **AKRITI**, they should appear before the undersigned on or before 20-04-2025 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard and name will be entered accordingly.

Issued today on 22nd day of the March, 2025 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal.

Sd/-
(NISHANT TOMAR, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Vijay Wardhan, IAS, Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Rohru,
District Shimla (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Smt. Krishna d/o Sh. Tulsi Chand presently w/o Panna Lal, r/o Village & P.O. Karasa,
Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public . . Respondent.

Subject.—Application under section 13 (3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, Smt. Krishna d/o Sh. Tulsi Chand presently w/o Panna Lal, r/o Village & P.O. Karasa, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) has filed an application alongwith affidavit in the court of the undersigned under section 13(3) of the Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969, to enter the date of birth of herself **(Krishna) (01-07-1969)** in the record of Birth Register of Gram Panchayat Arhal, Development Block Rohru.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to enter the date of birth of **(Krishna 01-07-1969)** they should appear before the court of undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice, either personally or through their authorized agent.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there is no objection and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 26th March, 2024.

Seal.

Sd/-
(VIJAY WARDHAN, IAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Bhanu Gupta (H.P.A.S.), Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shimla (Urban),
District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh**

Sh. Mingyur Wangmo d/o Sh. Karma Sonam, r/o H. No. MD-28, Tibetan Colony
Panthaghatti, Kasumpti, Shimla-9, Himachal Pradesh . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public . . Respondent.

Application under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Sh. Mingyur Wangmo d/o Sh. Karma Sonam, r/o H. No. MD-28, Tibetan Colony Panthaghatti, Kasumpti, Shimla-9, Himachal Pradesh has preferred an application to the undersigned for registration of date of birth of herself namely KAMAL THAPA (DOB-02-09-1976) at above address in the record of Municipal Corporation, Shimla.

Therefore, through this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection for entry of date of birth mentioned above, may submit his objection in writing in this court within 30 (Thirty) days from the date of publication of this notice in official Gazette. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on this 27th March, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Shimla (Urban), District Shimla (H.P.).*

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

केस नं० : / 2025

दायर तिथि :

श्री गिरधारी लाल पुत्र बलराम, निवासी सिंघपुरा, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेरे धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

प्रार्थी श्री गिरधारी लाल पुत्र बलराम, निवासी सिंघपुरा, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) का आवेदन पत्र एक मुख्य रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु/मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी, नाहन के पत्र एचएफडब्ल्यू-एन/एसटी/बीएण्डडी/डिलेय कैसिस/2024-13518, दिनांक 20-03-2025 द्वारा अनुलग्न क्रमशः अपना ब्यान हल्फी, दो गवाहन ब्यान हल्फी, आधार कार्ड सहित इस अदालत में प्राप्त हुआ है, जिसमें प्रार्थी द्वारा प्रार्थना की है कि उसकी स्वयं की जन्म तिथि 01-06-1967 है, जिसका अज्ञानतावंश प्रार्थी की स्वयं की जन्म तिथि का ईन्द्राज ग्राम पंचायत गोरखूवाला सिंघपुरा के जन्म अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं करवा सके हैं जिसे प्रार्थी अब दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे यदि किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-04-2025 को प्रातः 11.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व किसी भी दिन कार्य दिवस में अदालत हजा स्थित पांवटा साहिब में अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर उजर/एतराज दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित तिथि या इससे पूर्व में कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में गिरधारी लाल पुत्र बलराम, निवासी सिंघपुरा, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) के प्रकरण पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 29-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-

सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

केस नं० : / 2025

दायर तिथि :

श्री मामचंद पुत्र रामआसरा, निवासी बातामण्डी, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना—पत्र जेरे धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

प्रार्थी श्री मामचंद पुत्र रामआसरा, निवासी बातामण्डी, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) का एक आवेदन पत्र मुख्य रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु/मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी, नाहन के पत्र एचएफडब्ल्यू—एन/ एसटी/बीएण्डडी/डिलेय केसिस/2024—12416, दिनांक 24—02—2025 द्वारा अनुलग्न क्रमशः अपना ब्यान हल्फी, दो गवाहन ब्यान हल्फी, आधार कार्ड सहित इस अदालत में प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें प्रार्थी द्वारा प्रार्थना की है कि उसकी स्वयं की जन्म तिथि 03—12—1971 है, जिसका अज्ञानतावश प्रार्थी की स्वयं की जन्म तिथि का ईन्द्राज ग्राम पंचायत भांटावाली के जन्म अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं करवा सके हैं जिसे प्रार्थी अब दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे यदि किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29—04—2025 को प्रातः 11.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व किसी भी दिन कार्य दिवस में अदालत हजा स्थित पांवटा साहिब में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर उजर/एतराज दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित तिथि या इससे पूर्व में कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में मामचंद पुत्र रामआसरा, निवासी बातामण्डी, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) के प्रकरण पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 29—03—2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

केस नं० : / 2025

दायर तिथि :

श्री गुलजारी लाल पुत्र चुहड सिंह, निवासी किशनपुरा, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना—पत्र जेरे धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

प्रार्थी श्री गुलजारी लाल पुत्र चुहड सिंह, निवासी किशनपुरा, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) का एक आवेदन पत्र मुख्य रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु/मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी, नाहन के पत्र

एचएफडब्ल्यू-एन/एसटी/बीएण्डडी/डिलेय केसिस/2024-13881, दिनांक 27-03-2025 द्वारा अनुलग्न क्रमशः अपना ब्यान हल्फी, दो गवाहन ब्यान हल्फी, आधार कार्ड सहित इस अदालत में प्राप्त हुआ है, जिसमें प्रार्थी द्वारा प्रार्थना की है कि उसकी स्वयं की जन्म तिथि 03-10-1964 है, जिसका अज्ञानतावश प्रार्थी की स्वयं की जन्म तिथि का ईन्द्राज ग्राम पंचायत भांटावाली के जन्म अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं करवा सके हैं। जिसे प्रार्थी अब दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे यदि किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-04-2025 को प्रातः 11.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व किसी भी दिन कार्य दिवस में अदालत हजा स्थित पांवटा साहिब में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर उजर/एतराज दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित तिथि या इससे पूर्व में कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में श्री गुलजारी लाल पुत्र चुहड सिंह, निवासी किशनपुरा, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर, हि0प्र0 के प्रकरण पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 28-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री मन मोहन जिष्टू, सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी, शिलाई,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)

ब मुकद्दमा श्री पंच राम व श्री धर्म सिंह पुत्रगण स्व0 श्री बुधिया, निवासी ग्राम दियान्दो, डाकघर काण्डो भटनोल, तहसील शिलाई, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—मौजा दियान्दो के राजस्व अभिलेख में नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे।

श्री पंच राम व श्री धर्म सिंह पुत्रगण स्व0 श्री बुधिया, निवासी ग्राम दियान्दो, डाकघर काण्डो भटनोल, तहसील शिलाई, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) का आवेदन इस कार्यालय में प्राप्त हुआ है, जिसमें प्रार्थिगण मौजा दियान्दो के राजस्व अभिलेख में अपने पिता का नाम सोभा पुत्र भलखू के स्थान पर बुधिया पुत्र भलखू दर्ज करवाना चाहते हैं।

मामले में सुनवाई के दौरान वादीगण पंच राम व श्री धर्म सिंह ने इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर ब्यान कलमबंद किये हैं कि उनके पिता सोभा तथा बुधिया पुत्रगण भलखू का आपस में जोड़ीदार विवाह था। वादीगण दोनों के पिता का सही नाम बुधिया है जोकि उनके पंचायत अभिलेख तथा आधार कार्ड में भी दर्ज है, लेकिन मौजा दियान्दो के राजस्व अभिलेख में आवेदकों के पिता का नाम सोभा दर्ज है जोकि गलत है। आवेदकों ने यह भी ब्यान किया है कि मौजा दियान्दो के राजस्व अभिलेख में भी उनके पिता का नाम सोभा के स्थान पर बुधिया दर्ज किया जाना उचित होगा।

अतः सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि मौजा दियान्दो, तहसील शिलाई के राजस्व अभिलेख में आवेदकों के पिता का नाम सोभा पुत्र भलखू स्थान पर बुधिया पुत्र भलखू दर्ज करने बारे अगर किसी व्यक्ति को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अपनी आपत्ति इस अदालत में दिनांक 30-04-2025 सायं 05.00 बजे तक दर्ज करवा सकता है।

आज दिनांक 28-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय की मोहर द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / —
(मन मोहन जिष्टू),
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
शिलाई, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Preeti w/o Sh. Sunil Sharma, r/o Village Matahni, P.O. Daruhi, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor son's name from Takshak to Tushar Sharma for all purposes in future. Please note.

PREETI
w/o Sh. Sunil Sharma,
r/o Village Matahni, P.O. Daruhi,
Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, No. 4002338H Ex NK (MACP Hav) Tejinder Singh s/o Sh. Jaswant Singh, r/o Samkehar, P.O. Jhonka Ratial, Tehsil Jawali, District Kangra (H.P.) declare that in my discharge book & 2nd page of PPO my name wrongly written as Tajinder Singh instead of Tejinder Singh.

TEJINDER SINGH
s/o Sh. Jaswant Singh,
r/o Samkehar, P.O. Jhonka Ratial,
Tehsil Jawali, District Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Pyare Lal s/o Sh. Puran Chand, r/o Village Baila, P.O. Nandi, Tehsil Chachyot, District Mandi (H.P.) declare that my minor daughter's name Khushbu Devi in Aadhar No. 5909 8672 9008 is wrongly entered. Correct name is Khushboo Devi.

PYARE LAL
s/o Sh. Puran Chand,
r/o Village Baila, P.O. Nandi,
Tehsil Chachyot, District Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Bimla w/o Sh. Parmanand, r/o Village Dagrahan, P.O. Jakatkhana, Tehsil Sri Naina Devi Ji, District Bilaspur (H.P.) declare that in my Aadhar Card, PAN Card & in Voter Card my name wrongly entered as Vimla Devi whereas in my husband's Govt. record my name correctly entered as Bimla. My correct name is Bimla & I shall be known as Bimla for all purposes in future. Please note.

BIMLA
w/o Sh. Parmanand,
r/o Village Dagrahan, P.O. Jakatkhana,
Tehsil Sri Naina Devi Ji, District Bilaspur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Viyasa Devi aged about 77 years, w/o Shri Kashmir Chand, r/o Village & P.O. Bahi, Tehsil Baijnath, District Kangra (H.P.)-176125 declare that I have changed my name in the Aadhar Card No. 7131 8500 2688 from Biasan Devi to Viyasa Devi. All concerned please may note.

VIYASA DEVI
w/o Shri Kashmir Chand,
r/o Village & P.O. Bahi,
Tehsil Baijnath, District Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Prashant s/o Sh. Kalam Singh, Village Jailot, P.O. Thana, Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.) declare that name of my son Addy Nepta is wrongly mentioned as Kaka in his Aadhar Card. Therefore it should be changed to Addy Nepta in his Aadhar Card.

PRASHANT
s/o Sh. Kalam Singh,
Village Jailot, P.O. Thana,
Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Shabnam w/o Sh. Ajay Kumar, r/o Village Chowra, P.O. Sherpur, Tehsil Dalhousie, District Chamba (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor daughter's name from Ishika to Anshika Thakur for all purposes in future. Please note.

SHABNAM
w/o Sh. Ajay Kumar,
r/o Village Chowra, P.O. Sherpur,
Tehsil Dalhousie, District Chamba (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Jimoli Devi w/o Sh. Chuhi Ram, r/o Village & P.O. Tatiyana, Tehsil Kamrau, District Sirmaur (H.P.) declare that in my Aadhar Card No. 7225 7694 7933 my name is entered as Vimoli Devi which is incorrect. My correct name is Jimoli Devi. All concerned note.

JIMOLI DEVI
w/o Sh. Chuhi Ram,
r/o Village & P.O. Tatiyana,
Tehsil Kamrau, District Sirmaur (H.P.).